3 1761 03554 7074

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto

http://www.archive.org/details/churchworldessa00ship

3394 90 I

The Church and the World.

1867.

BY THE SAME EDITOR.

In course of Publication, by various Writers,

Tracts for the Day:

A SERIES OF ESSAYS ON THEOLOGICAL SUBJECTS.

No. 1.—Priestly Absolution; Scriptural. 48 pp. Price 9*d*.
2nd Thousand.

No. 2.—Purgatory. 48pp. Price 9*d*. *2nd Thousand.*

No. 3.—The Seven Sacraments. 88 pp. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

No. 4.—Miracles and Prayer. *Price* 6*d*.

No. 5.—The Real Presence. *In the Press.*

Others in preparation.

Uniform with the present Volume. Third Edition. Price 15*s*.

The Church and the World:

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY IN 1866.

Printed uniformly, and bound in limp cloth, with red edges,
Price 7*s*. 6*d*. each.

Second Edition.

Lyra Messianica:

HYMNS AND VERSES ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

Second Edition.

Lyra Eucharistica:

HYMNS AND VERSES ON THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Lately Published.

Lyra Mystica:

HYMNS AND VERSES ON SACRED SUBJECTS.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co.

The Church and the World:

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

IN

1867.

BY VARIOUS WRITERS.

322306
12. 35
16.

EDITED BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

London:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.
1867.

[*All rights reserved.*]

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

Preface.

The success attending the First Series of *The Church and the World*—a success proved by the wide and rapid circulation of two large Editions within a year of its publication; and the interest excited by that Volume—an interest shown by the number of reviews and critical notices which have appeared in the chief organs of public opinion—political, religious, and literary—have encouraged the Editor to prepare, and the Publishers to issue, a Second Series of "Essays on Questions of the Day."

The present Volume contains Essays on Subjects similar to those published in the First Series of the Work; and "is put forth in the hope," expressed in the Preface to the earlier Book, "that it may serve towards the solution of certain important 'Questions of the Day' upon which the Church and the World come into contact."

Although the Essays in both Volumes represent a like School of thought, yet, it has been considered

advisable that the Subjects discussed in the SECOND SERIES of *The Church and the World* should be treated by Authors distinct from those who contributed to the FIRST. Hence, the name of no Writer who was good enough to contribute to the FIRST SERIES appears in the Table of Contents of the SECOND.

Two of the Essays are anonymous. "Sisterhood Life" is from the pen of a Sister of an Anglican Convent. The treatise entitled "On the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical," "by a Magistrate," though now re-written and enlarged, has, in part, been previously printed.

It is only needful to add, as stated in the Preface to the FIRST SERIES :—

Firstly, that "The several Authors of the following Essays are responsible only for the statements contained in their own contributions;" and

Secondly, that "The Essays have been written independently of one another; and in the treatment of their subjects the Writers have been left free to express their individual convictions."

ORBY SHIPLEY.

Easter, A.D. 1867.

Contents.

NO.		PAGE
1.	Some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833 By William J. E. Bennett, M.A., *Vicar of Froome-Selwood, Somerset.*	1
2.	Preachers and Preaching: the Pulpit and the Press By the Rev. A. B. Evans, D.D., *Rector of S. Mary-le-Strand.*	27
3.	The Sacrament of Marriage By John Walter Lea, B.A., F.G.S.	73
4.	Public Law and the Colonial Church By the Rev. Edmund Huff, M.A., *Vicar of Little Cawthorpe, Louth.*	113
5.	On Greek Rites in the West By the Bishop of Brechin.	145
6.	Sisterhood Life	166
7.	Private Confession and Absolution By the Rev. John Charles Chambers, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of S. Mary the Virgin, Crown Street, Soho.*	196
8.	Religious Toleration By the Rev. Maxwell J. Blacker, M.A.	232
9.	Church Music By J. W. Rumsey, *Vicar of Rolvenden, and Precentor of the Canterbury Diocesan Choral Union.*	264
10.	The Curate Question By Arthur Baker, M.A., *Curate.*	295

NO. PAGE

11. A Layman's View of Confession 336
By John David Chambers, M.A., *Recorder of Salisbury.*

12. On the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical . 399
By a Magistrate.

13. The Ritual Law of the Church of England . . . 434
By the Hon. Colin Lindsay.

14. Latitudinarianism 472
By the Rev. Joseph Oldknow, D.D., *Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, Birmingham.*

15. The Three Vows 502
By the Rev. William Humphrey, *Incumbent of S. Mary Magdalene, Dundee.*

16. On the Symbolism of Ritual 523
By the Rev. Charles James LeGeyt, M.A., *Incumbent of S. Matthias, Stoke Newington.*

The Church and the World:

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

Some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833.

Times of decay and corruption have ever marked the history of the Church; and such a time was plainly visible among ourselves during the first quarter of the present century. There was indeed a strong party which arrogated to itself an Ecclesiastical position, and contained within it a certain degree of spiritual life; but since it made a subjective faith the sole criterion of religion, and utterly disregarded both Sacramental grace and Apostolic order, it approached rather the confines of Dissent, and could hardly be held, with truth, to be within the Catholic Church. There was also a party of the Hanoverian Church and State Religion, which made salvation to consist in obedience to Acts of Parliament, but utterly disregarded the spirituality of the inner life. Bishops, deans, and other dignitaries of the Church were principally remarkable for the pluralities which they held by favour of the Crown, for the benefices which they heaped upon their relatives, and for the immense fortunes which they carried to their graves. The one party, usually called "The Evangelical," took up the Bible and the Prayer Book as the rule of life, but ignored all interpretation of them save by their own private judgment; the

other, called "The Orthodox," took up the same sacred books, but interpreted them solely by Parliamentary Rubrics and the dicta of Episcopal secretaries. If there was any morality in the country, it was but little above the teaching of Aristotle; if any study of Holy Scripture, it was little more than by comparison of Evidences depending upon Paley; if any preaching of GOD'S Word, it was sententious, dry, and formal, after the manner of Blair; if any faith, it was that of Simeon, who so fatally held rule in Cambridge; and last of all, if there was any kind of zeal, or earnestness, or devotion to GOD, it was wild, reckless, and ungovernable, after the teaching of Wesley. Outside of the two parties which thus caused between them these elements of discord, each despising the other, and each striving to obtain predominance in the government and the preferments of the Church, there was nothing whatever for the true Catholic mind to dwell upon, no authority for faith, no source of dogmatic teaching, no consolation or remedy for the sins of penitents, no outpouring of loving souls in devotion, no truths which could in reality move or reach the heart. The Church was altogether at its lowest ebb-tide. The sea had gone out to its very farthest point. There was a wide-spreading dismal sand to look upon; an unruffled, unmarked expanse; without verdure, without a tree, without a rock, without a resting-place for the foot of man—a dreary, desolate level.

And the enemy of souls, taking advantage of this dull stagnation and recklessness of faith, was stirring up every evil passion to damage, and, if possible, to destroy that which alone could successfully withstand him, i. e. the true Catholic Church. He was striving to pull down the few strongholds that remained, either by undermining the positions of authority from which the Church could yet speak, or by infusing secret infidelity within the hearts of her people. Ten bishopries were swept away from the Irish Church at one fell swoop; and even the English Bishops themselves were told by the Prime Minister to "set their houses in order." A Government which professed to be liberal was preparing the way for Church destruction, under the appearance of Church reform. The Press teemed with pamphlets advocating the strangest mutilations of the Prayer Book, for the sake of accommodating infidels and dissenters. Dr. Arnold, a schoolmaster of great repute among Latitudinarians, and marked out by the public voice as the successor of the next Episcopal vacancy, proposed openly that all sects and denominations should be united together by Act of Parliament and should use the churches in turns. We were to see the Altars of the Church of

England in the morning, giving way to the tables of the Presbyterian in the evening; and JESUS CHRIST, preached at noon to be the SON of GOD, was to be announced in the evening out of the same pulpit as no more than a great Prophet. The desire of the people was to abolish the Athanasian Creed altogether; and many of the clergy conformed to their desire by never using it. The mention of the Holy TRINITY was considered either an antiquated ceremony or a Popish abuse. The doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, containing the Sacrifice and the Real Presence of CHRIST, was not indeed objected to, but simply because it was unheard of and untaught; but the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, of Confession to a priest, of Absolution, of the Sacerdotal power, conferred by Apostolical Succession—all such doctrines were whispered occasionally, only to meet with the loudest cry of "Popery," and the derision of the multitude.

But it is proverbially said, that the darkest hour of the night is that which immediately precedes the twilight. Just so, in GOD'S mercy, was it with the Church at this time. Towards the summer of the year 1833, in the midst of this miserable gloom, a little ray of light began to appear. An Association was formed at Oxford for the purpose of checking, if possible, these latitudinarian tendencies. It was not a council of Bishops, nor in any way of older or experienced men, but consisted entirely of younger priests, and of men till then unknown in the Church. The principal persons who formed this Association were Mr. Froude, of Oriel College, Oxford; Mr. Perceval; Mr. Palmer of Worcester; John Henry Newman; and our late beloved friend, John Keble. Hugh James Rose, of Cambridge, was also in correspondence with these Oxford men, and in some degree entered into their plans. The first result of this Association was the circulation of addresses to the Bishops, Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the King, with declarations from the laity in all parts of the kingdom, stating the loyalty with which all were determined to maintain the Church intact. This, together with the fact that shortly after there was a change of Government, saved all further apprehension of danger for the moment.

Shortly afterwards, out of this Association, and emanating from the same individuals who composed it, arose the idea of publishing for popular circulation short papers or Tracts on some of the more important doctrines of the Church. It was desired to embrace such subjects as seemed peculiar to the necessities of the times, and thence to be called *Tracts for the Times*. These *Tracts* were immediately commenced, not, however, by the members of the Association as a general body, responsible for all that was

written, nor indeed upon any consecutive system, but by individuals here and there as occasion served. Mr. Palmer from the first objected to these *Tracts*, observing, as he thought, some questionable points involved in them; and in consequence he subsequently withdrew from the Association and held aloof. The death of Mr. Froude, which took place so prematurely, and the withdrawal of Mr. Palmer, very soon left the management of the *Tracts* in the hands principally of Newman and Keble, with whom was subsequently joined, towards the close of the year 1833, the name of Dr. Pusey. The value of Dr. Pusey's name, and his co-operation in the *Tracts*, was felt by all. It is thus described in the *Apologia* :—"It was under these circumstances [the *Tracts* needing more method and order in their publication] that Dr. Pusey joined us. I had known him well since 1827-8, and had felt for him an enthusiastic admiration. I used to call him ὁ μέγας. His great learning, his immense diligence, his scholar-like mind, his simple devotion to the cause of religion, overcame me; and great, of course, was my joy when in the last days of 1833 he showed a disposition to make common cause with us. He was not, however, I think, fully associated with the movement till 1835 and 1836, when he published his Tract on Baptism, and started *The Library of the Fathers*. He at once gave to us a position and a name." (Newman's *Apologia*, p. 136.)

Thus, then, the *Tracts* being established, they gradually made their way in every quarter, shedding their influence on all ranks, both clergy and people, and inducing a new turn of thought on all matters connected with Church discipline and doctrine. They were, however, by no means the only publications which issued from the precincts of Oxford. Publications of similar character and from the same men swarmed from the Press. In 1836, *The Library of the Fathers* was established. In the same year, in opposition to Dr. Wiseman, the *Prophetical Office* appeared from the pen of Mr. Newman, and in 1837 his *Essay on Justification*. In 1838, Froude's *Remains* appeared, which created an extraordinary sensation by the unsparing and startling manner in which these subjects were treated; and about the same time Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*. In 1840, *Tracts on the Church and her Office*, by Mr. Faber, were first printed in the *British Magazine*.

It was not to be supposed that all these writings, determined and uncompromising as they were, and at the same time full of the deepest learning and intellectual power, could continue long without opposition. The enemy who sat on the thrones of the World, under the guise of Infidelity and Liberalism, jointly with the two opposing parts of religion, Protestantism and the Catholic

Church, could not thus be brought together in controversy without a collision. The first manifestation of this arose in the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity in Oxford. This was taken as a sign that *the World* intended to put down *the Church* and her Tract writers. Oxford must learn a lesson of greater liberality. But it was not unresisted. Men of all shades of opinion united to repel the gratuitous insult of the Prime Minister in forcing a Professor on the University, who had been condemned of unsound teaching. Never was a time of greater anxiety; never a time in which the World seemed to gain the upper hand, when, in spite of all opposition, Dr. Hampden assumed the Regius Professor's chair, and thus became the teacher of Divinity to at least one half of the rising clergy of England.

But the Tract writers were equal to the emergency. They worked the harder, they wrote the more. Advancing more boldly into the enemy's camp, they sent forth Tract upon Tract, until at last they approached the fatal Number 90. Before the publication of that number, although many previous ones had elicited much observation, and in some cases much alarm, still nothing had been said in any authoritative condemnation. Now, however, No. 90 seemed in the eyes of almost all to be beyond toleration. It was not understood—its purport was not seen. Men rushed with blind determination to convict it of dishonesty, even, perhaps, before they had read it. It drew down upon the head of its devoted author, not only the condemnation of an inconsiderate World, for that could not have been of much moment, but even of the Heads of Houses in the University, and of the good Bishop, Dr. Bagot, who then presided over the see of Oxford. Kind and most considerate was that worthy Bishop, but still it seemed that public opinion demanded a sacrifice. The author of the *Tract*, persecuted on all sides, evil spoken of, suspected, yet still beloved by his own immediate friends, was compelled to give way. Retiring from Littlemore, where he had a pastoral charge, and ultimately from Oxford itself, he never recovered his position. Obeying the commands of the Bishop, he ceased to write any further; and after nine years, involving the most interesting epoch of the English Church, the *Tracts* were at last discontinued. They never appeared again.

But the work was done. As one of the martyrs of the Reformation had said—"Such a fire had been kindled in England as could never be put out!" The grosser and more unjust the treatment which the authors of the *Tracts* received, the more

men of every shade of opinion very soon began to study and embrace them. The more startling at first sight, owing to the dense ignorance of Catholicity into which both laity and clergy had been immersed, were the doctrines which were announced; the more they set the whole of educated society, specially the younger clergy, to read further and deeper for themselves. The booksellers found it necessary to raise the prices of "the Fathers," and the English divines of the seventeenth century became the most popular reading of the day. "Tractarianism" was the by-word by which hundreds of those who took up these views were greeted in the World; and he who dared to assert the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, or the Real Presence, Fasting, or the Daily Sacrifice, was honourably distinguished by the name of "Puseyite." A school had arisen.

And what has been the result? Twenty-five years have passed since the *Tract No.* 90 was condemned. Time enough to pronounce a judgment. Have the doctrines of the *Tracts* advanced, or have they retrograded? Have the *Tracts* ceased to exercise any influence on the Church, to form the character of the clergy, or to shape the minds of the laity in receiving doctrine, or have they become valueless? Was it all a mere temporary furor, the momentary passion of indiscreet young men?—or was it a movement coming from the Holy Ghost, in mercy looking upon the decaying embers of the Catholic Church in England? If the *Tracts* had contained poison or heretical error, as their opponents asserted, if they had been unfaithful to Catholic truth, as the Heads of Houses and the Bishops maintained, some even saying that they were the offspring of Satan[1]—they would assuredly, long ago, according to the universal dealing of God with the Church, have been buried in oblivion. Is it so? The tree is known by its fruits. Are these fruits here? If so, are they good or are they bad?

Now certainly, at first, the results of the *Tracts* were, as we should judge according to human appearance, most disastrous. Many embracing them to the full, the most zealous and the best, fell away under the clouds which seemed to arise around them; and many of those, who began by being defenders of the Church under their banner, took part against her and deserted her. The names of Oakeley, Allies, Ward, Dodsworth, the two Wilberforces, and Manning, nay, even John Henry Newman

[1] Dr. Sumner, then Bishop of Chester, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Charge, 1842, *distinctly and at some length attributed the* Tracts *to the agency of Satan;* and all the Bishops, in their Charges of those days, invariably condemned them.

himself, great and noble as he was, will recall our memory to the losses which the Church sustained, as year by year these men fell away from their stedfastness; and, not seeing behind the cloud the silver lining, would not abide in the ship. Yes:—those who wrote in the *Tracts* in behalf of the Church were soon found to be writing against her. They had changed sides. Those who were priests in her communion, abandoned their allegiance and fled—some for one reason, some for another, and were even as hirelings, because they cared not for the sheep.

Such indeed were disastrous results; and to these for a long time the enemy pointed as proofs of the false teaching which the *Tracts* had put forth. We confess they *were* disastrous results. We deny not that the losses of the Church of England in the names above recited are great, and perhaps can never be repaired.

Another result was equally unfortunate. A popular clamour arose, shouting out the old religious cry of "Popery;" and when Cardinal Wiseman, in the year 1850, appeared with a new hierarchy, advancing direct from the Pope into the heart of London, giving himself the title of Archbishop of Westminster—the blame was laid upon the *Tracts*, and a crafty Prime Minister, desiring to support his tottering popularity, seized hold of the cry, and by means of an infamously notorious letter to the Bishop of Durham, denouncing the teaching of the clergy who were of the same opinions as those advocated by the *Tracts*, stirred up the mob against them. Many outrages were committed, under the colour of which this insidious and unscrupulous man managed to advance his political purposes and to retain his power, while in reality like Gallio he cared for none of these things. Mobs attacked the church of S. Barnabas, in London, to which the Durham Letter referred; and by which the otherwise estimable Bishop of London being terrified, abandoned the principles of the Church which a short time before, in his Charge of 1848, he had himself advocated. Subsequently, similar mobs attacked the church of S. George's-in-the-East, and the magistrates, and even Ministers of State, nay, indeed the whole Government of the day, seemed to enjoy the sport of a persecuted priest and a desecrated church, taking part with infidels and the vilest refuse of society, rather than uphold justice, and defend the truths which at least some of them were known to profess.

These were indeed, at first, discreditable and unhappy results; things that could not be looked upon then, nor even now remembered, without sorrow and contempt:—sorrow for those who were unhappily misled, from weakness of character or love of the world; contempt for those who had not the courage to defend that

which they knew was right. But is it not ever the case, that through much tribulation we must enter the Kingdom of God? Nothing good, either in this world or the next, is gained without difficulty. Is it not the fact, that every great movement in the Church which is urged against the popular will, which arrests the follies of the people, or which denounces the sins of the great, must of necessity encounter the opposition of the World? It might be rather taken as a proof of the intrinsic value of the movement of 1833 that it *did* meet with opposition, that it *was* unpopular, that men *did* rise up against it—just as it may be taken to be a sure sign of being right, if the *Times* newspaper writes against any measure of religion which is advocated. Christians do not like to be told that they are, more or less, by the frivolous habits which they indulge, living a life of self-contradiction. The luxurious and the effeminate do not like to be told that they must deny themselves and fast; the sinful that they must repent and pray; the covetous that they must give alms. But this was, in effect, what the *Tracts* told the world. Nor again, as was the case at that time, bishops and deans, canons and dignitaries, did not like to be reminded that to be possessed of incomes of 20,000*l.* or 30,000*l.* a year was not quite after the pattern of the poverty of the Apostles, whom by theory they were succeeding. Incumbents of wealthy parishes, when they were in the habit of keeping their churches locked up all the week, and opened once or twice on Sunday, did not like to be reminded of the tolling of a bell at Matins and Evensong for prayer daily. Fashionable young men, having with difficulty achieved a degree at Oxford or Cambridge, and who stood waiting for a family living, and had no other possible vocation for the life of the Priesthood, but that they might take the priest's share with Hophni and Phinehas, did not like to be reminded that Holy Orders involved a fearful responsibility, and that if they sought the Priest's Office for filthy lucre's sake, they might run the risk of sin against the Holy Ghost. No! These things of the religion of the Gospel men did not like to hear. But the *Tracts* would not let them be ignorant of them; and like Ahab and Michaiah, when the prophets told them the truth, they hated them, for they did not speak good concerning them but evil. Hence the troubles and the misfortunes of the first outset of the movement. It was natural. It was to be expected. It was good. "Blessed are ye, when men shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for My sake."

But the real question as to the success of any work must be determined by its ultimate, not by its immediate results, by its

generally pervading character, not by local or temporary failures. We must compare the position of the Church, as she was before the year 1833, not with those unhappy periods when a momentary pressure was laid upon her, such as that of the Durham Letter, the Jerusalem Bishopric, or the Gorham Judgment; at all which periods the weak and the unstable fell to the ground bewildered—but we must compare 1833 with 1867. We must look at the doctrines as *then* maintained, with those *now* maintained, and that *generally:* we must look at the character and lives of the clergy, at the hold which the Church has upon the poor; we must look, not at her Episcopal representation in the House of Lords, but at her Sacerdotal representation at her Altars, and her doctrinal representation in her pulpits and her schools. When we have done this, but not till then, shall we be able to say what have been the results of the *Tracts for the Times.*

First then, as to *the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.* What was Baptism in the opinion of the world in the commencement of the present century? One of the *Tracts* says:—"It is to be feared that we have been over-near certain celebrated Protestant teachers, Puritan or Latitudinarian, and have suffered in consequence. Hence we have almost embraced the doctrine that GOD conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies; that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or what is called communion with GOD, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the Church and her Sacraments are the ordained and visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen. . . . And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that Baptism conveys Regeneration. . . . It has been with the view of meeting this cardinal deficiency (as it may be termed) in the religion of the day, that the *Tract* on *Baptism* has been inserted." (*Tracts for the Times,* Vol. ii. Preface.)

This refers to Dr. Pusey's *Tract* on *Holy Baptism,* which drew forth censures and replies from every quarter and of infinite hue, as though Regeneration in Baptism was a thing never heard of before! And yet the Prayer Book then was the same as it is now. The third chapter of the Gospel according to S. John has not altered in the course of these years. The Catechism which declares, that "being children of wrath by nature, we are made *in Baptism* children of grace," teaches nothing that it did not teach in 1833. Strange; yet not more strange than true. Baptism, as a Sacrament, was well-nigh lost among the English people. Common basins were brought into the churches, while the fonts were made into flower-pots for the gardens of the parsonage. It

was very questionable in many cases whether the water when used really did touch the person of the child meant to be baptized. The prayers which in the Baptismal Office asserted the doctrine of the New Birth, were frequently altered in the recitation, or altogether omitted. The water was frequently not blessed or consecrated; and the whole service was studiously mutilated, to escape the doctrine which it involved. But now, in the year 1867, these things are hardly ventured upon. Tacitly, or in circuitous phraseology, the doctrine may still be set aside by a certain party; but openly and before the Church no one dares to gainsay the Catholic doctrine any longer. The fonts of churches, as representatives of the doctrine, are carefully restored and respected; and thanks to a liberal Government which has separated Registration from Baptism, we are no longer compelled to baptize as a secular custom, that the birth of a child may stand on record; but we resort to the Sacrament, purely and solely as the means provided by the Church for the spiritual life of the child, to be born of water and of the Holy Ghost.

Secondly.—*The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.* Two questions are here involved. The doctrine of Sacrifice, and of the Real Presence. Dr. Newman tells us in his *Apologia:*—"When a correspondent, in good faith, wrote to a newspaper to say that the *Sacrifice* of the Holy Eucharist, spoken of in the *Tract,* was a false print for *Sacrament,* I thought the mistake too pleasant to be corrected before I was asked about it."—(*Apologia,* p. 115.) This may be a fair representation of the doctrine held by the general average of the Bishops and clergy at that time; and of course, therefore, in *the World* any idea of a Sacrifice in the Blessed Eucharist would have been a chimera. An act of memorial—an Agape, or Love Feast, a solemn record of Jesus' Passion and Death—that would have been the sum-total of the general idea of the Holy Eucharist in those days. So then, the *Tracts* went forth on this great subject as on the others, and a long Catena, giving a list of English divines who held the doctrine of the Sacrifice and Real Presence was given to the world. The Catena extended from Jewell down to Bishop Philpotts of Exeter. Look at *Tract* 81. It speaks of the short-comings of the whole Church, as though all love of the Blessed Sacrament had departed and its doctrines had vanished. Yet the Catechism taught the true doctrine then as now. The Office for the celebration of Holy Communion described the same things to be said and done then as now. Wherein was the difference? *Then,* words were spoken which conveyed no meaning. They were dead, meaningless, perfunctory operations. *Now,* life is thrown into

them by the doctrine of the Catholic faith. When Dr. Pusey, in 1843, put forth his remarkable sermon entitled *Holy Communion a Comfort for the Penitent,* the World was startled. Yes:—and much more than the World: the learned University itself was startled. The sermon stated:—"The same reality of the Divine gift makes it angels' food to the saint and a ransom to the sinner. And both because it is the Body and Blood of CHRIST. Were it *only* a thankful commemoration of His redeeming love, or *only* a showing forth of His death, or *only* a strengthening and refreshing of the soul, it were indeed a reasonable service, but it could have no direct healing to the sinner. To him its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer's very broken Body; it is His Blood which was shed for the remission of his sins. In the words of the ancient Church, he 'drinks his ransom,' he eateth 'the very Body and Blood of the LORD, the only Sacrifice for sin.' GOD poureth out for him 'the most precious Blood of His Only-begotten; they are fed from the cross of the LORD' because they eat His Body and Blood." (*Sermon,* p. 18.)

For this doctrine, this holy comforting doctrine, this true Catholic doctrine—who would believe it now!—our dear friend was absolutely condemned by the University of Oxford, and suspended for two years. But, patience! The learned University of Oxford had to learn as well as the rest of the world. It condemned because it was ignorant. Time advanced. The same doctor preached again when his suspension was over, and reiterated the condemned doctrine. Ten years had passed, and the same sermon was continued as though nothing had intervened, and *then* the doctrine was received. How dignified, how grand, how noble was that patient waiting for the teaching of time. The second sermon is entitled, *The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.* The sermon states:—"The Presence of which our LORD speaks has been termed Sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, opposed, not to what is real, but to what is natural. . . . . It is a Presence without us, not within us only, a Presence by virtue of our LORD'S words, although to us it becomes a saving Presence, received to our salvation through our Faith. . . . . The word Body is no figure. For our LORD says 'This is My Body;' and not so only, but 'This is My Body which is given for you.' Since then it was His true Body which was given *for* us on the Cross, it is His true Body which is given *to* us in the Sacrament. The manner of the Presence of the Body is different. The Body which is present is the same; for He has said, 'This is My Body which is given for you.'" (*Sermon,* pp. 22—32.)

But this was not all. The University indeed had within the ten years learned to accept the doctrine; but not so altogether the Church at large. More battles were to be fought. Among others, Achdeacon Denison taught the doctrine of the Real Presence to his candidates for ordination; and thence arose the extraordinary trial of the faith which terminated in an ignominious conclusion at Bath. The doctrine was condemned by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his own person, but the judgment was resisted. The Church was harassed by an unworthy and undignified contest which ended in nothing, while several priests of determined mind entered their solemn protest against the whole proceeding of the Archbishop, reiterating the doctrine and challenging a new verdict for the truth. This protest was signed by seventeen priests, two of whom where Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble, and appealed in "*the first instance to a free and lawful Synod of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, and then, if need be, to a free and lawful Synod of all the Churches of our Communion, when such, by God's mercy, may be had.*"

After this, nothing further was heard of the silly trial of Ditcher *versus* Denison. It died a natural death. But what became of the doctrine? From 1853, when it passed the judgment of the Heads of Houses in Oxford, to 1867, when at length no one is inclined to resist it, it has grown and multiplied with wonderful rapidity, according to the saying—*Magna est veritas et prævalebit.* In 1857, he whom now it has pleased GOD to take to his rest—the saintly John Keble—set forth the seal and conclusion of the whole, in his own beautiful and loving way, in a work entitled *Eucharistic Adoration.* From that moment the whole question has been suffered to advance in peace. It is preached in the pulpit, it is announced in books, it is taught to children in their catechizing, and every where it is embraced in faith. And as to the practice which has followed it, how has it gathered round itself all suitable adjuncts for its development. From a tri-monthly to a monthly, from a monthly to a weekly, from a weekly to a daily Celebration now in many churches, it has gradually advanced. Practice is observed tallying with doctrine, and doctrine eliciting practice. The Office which sets it forth in the Prayer Book, formerly in nine cases out of ten terminating abruptly at the Nicene Creed, and leaving the Altar from whence it was announced bare and shapeless, now is brought to its legitimate termination amid crowds of rejoicing communicants. The priest, or priest and deacon, formerly standing with faces opposite each other, and leaning over the Altar in apparently amicable conference, now appear in their Sacerdotal position, as though

they were in reality occupied in the great Sacrifice which it is their office to offer. Formerly an ordinary surplice, and frequently not over-clean or seemly, covered the person of the ministering priest, no difference being manifested between that and all other offering of prayer; now the ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here before GOD's Altar is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious than aught that man can speak of, namely, the Presence of the SON of GOD in human Flesh subsisting. And towards this are tending with all the ancient rites of the Church, which are now in course of restoration. The solemn music, and the smoke of the incense go up before GOD, assuring the World that here is no appearance only of love, but a reality and a depth which human hearts cannot fathom, nor even the angels themselves. The incense is the Mediation of JESUS ascending from the Altar to plead for the sins of man[1].

Thirdly.—*The use of Private Devotions and Sacramental Confession.* As long as the public services of the Church, and above all, her Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, were thus kept in abeyance, and the Houses of GOD were seldom opened except on one day in the week; it followed that there could be but little idea of any resort to the deeper and more interior devotions of the soul; and no wonder that the priests of GOD, seldom seen by the people but in the pulpit, knew little of their sins or of their sorrows. Of books of devotion there were hardly any, beyond Nelson's *Fasts and Festivals,* Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata,* and Wilson on the *Lord's Supper.* Sometimes was found Kettlewell's *Guide to the Penitent,* and Bishop Cosin's *Devotions,* together with those of Bishop Andrews; but even these were hardly accessible in a cheap form to the poor and middle classes. The dryness of the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society, the weariness of their style, the stiff determination with which they excluded all Catholicity of feeling and warmth of heart, rendered all their works a burden to the poor and unlearned. They hindered devotion rather than promoted it.

But *Tract* No. 75 brought forward, though of course not without objection, the history of the Breviary, and suggested those devotions as a foundation for future books in the English Church:—"It will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of the

[1] "It is in accordance with the truth of the Sacrament, that the enlarged life among us has especially taken the form of increased Sacraments. The Wesleyan bodies would increase their prayer-meetings, of which some of them have spoken to me as *their* means of grace. Protestant bodies have their revivals. The Church of England multiplied the celebration of its Sacraments." (*Eirenicon,* p. 276.)

adversaries' hands, who have in this, as well as many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was ours as much as theirs. . . . It may suggest character and matter for our private devotions, over and above what our Reformers have thought fit to adopt into our public services; a use of it, which will be but carrying out and completing what they have begun." (*Tracts for the Times*, No. 75.)

In the Breviary, which this Tract in great part translated, various hymns of ancient Catholic use are found, and from this source, thus opened out to the Church, arose that immense flood of devotional hymns which now form so popular a part of our services. *The Christian Year*, in 1827, had led the way; but even this may be justly set down as part of the *Tract* system, springing as it did from one of their authors; but now, in addition to this, throughout the Missal and the Breviary, many old Latin hymns were quickly selected and adopted for Church use. Books of devotion also serving the same purpose were issued, as e. g. Avrillon's *Guide for Advent* and *Lent;* Nouet's *Life of Christ in Glory;* Pinart's *Nourishment for the Christian Soul;* Horst's *Paradise of the Christian Soul;* and many beautiful *Litanies* derived from ancient sources; the *Lyra Apostolica* also, and *Lyra Innocentium;* and subsequently the *Lyra Eucharistica* and *Lyra Messianica;* and other works which need not be specified. These and such-like books, in prose and poetry, have helped forward the movement, by training, supporting, and advancing souls in thoughtfulness, in meditation, in self-preparation for the Kingdom of God.

And then, moreover, added to this, the Sacrament of Absolution came into question. The *Tracts* had taught in their very first outset, the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, and thence the Power of the Keys. They had urged the great necessity of attention to those inner movements of the mind which require the spiritual guidance of the priesthood. Much agitation has taken place and many troubles have arisen, as in the case of Mr. Poole at S. Barnabas, Pimlico—but nevertheless the essential good prevails over the accidental evil. Dr. Pusey's *Letter to Mr. Richards* set the matter on its true foundation as to jurisdiction, and Mr. Gresley's work on the same subject, entitled *The Ordinance of Confession*, explains both the doctrine and the practice. Who is there that is now past the meridian of life, that can look back at the days of his youth, and before the *Tracts* arose, without thankfulness to God for the change which he beholds? Who can look at the services of the Church, when Tate and Brady held sway, varied by Sternhold and Hopkins, and not welcome with joy the cheering hymnody with which now the Church is full? Who

will not look back at his school-days, and the days of his University teaching, if haply they were before the year 1833, and remembering the many trials, temptations, and sins which he was compelled to bear without a guide, and without any friendly priest before whom he could open his grief, and not now rejoice to see the Church restored to the Catholic love, the faithful care, and the watchful direction which is every where manifested in her renovated priesthood.

It will not form an unsuitable conclusion to this portion of the present Essay to reprint the following extracts from a *Letter* of Dr. Pusey to the Editor of the *Times*, in which that distinguished divine recounts some of his own experiences of the results of the Tractarian movement of 1833, on the subject under discussion. Dr. Pusey thus writes:—"I wish to state, ... as to Confession, no High Churchman, as far as I know, teaches or thinks that we have 'any right to *enforce* confession, or to *demand* confession and penance.' Now you, Sir, I suppose, would be one of the last to deny members of the Church of England the same liberty of conscience which is allowed to others. If we, clergy or people, think that it is good for our souls to confess our sins specifically, not only to GOD, but also to His minister, whatever you may think of our wisdom in so doing, you would not deny us the liberty of so doing. It is not a question of the liberty of the people not to confess their sins, but of the liberty of clergy and people to confess their sins, if they wish it. It is now above a quarter of a century since Confession so much increased; it sprang not from the teaching of the clergy, but from our consciences, whether clergy or people. (For I suppose that a larger *proportion* of the clergy have used confession than of the laity; and that no clergyman would receive confessions of others' sins who did not also confess his own.) What was taught thirty years ago more strongly than before, was the great offensiveness and ingratitude of heavy sin, and a somewhat stern doctrine of repentance. The Prayer Book, not we, taught Confession. As a fact, the practice of Confession was revived, while not a word was said about Absolution; the teaching followed the practice; and as it began, so was it continued. The use of Confession among us all—priests and people—*is* very large. It pervades every rank, from the peer to the artisan or peasant. In the course of this quarter of a century (to instance my own experience, which I must know), I have been applied to, to receive confessions from persons in every rank, of every age, old as well as young, in every profession, even those which you would think least accessible to it—army, navy, medicine, law. But in almost every

case (I mean except some very few, in which I suggested it from my knowledge of the individual,) the desire came from the persons themselves. And what has been my own experience has been, so far as I have gathered it, the experience of other clergy. You may think it unwise; but, you, I am sure, would not restrict our liberty of conscience, and I may say that, in the case of distressing, habitual, and very real sins of young men, they have found Confession of the greatest benefit in conquering them. They have been made better members of society through it."

Fourthly.—*The Adjustment and Re-union of the Churches.* There must of necessity be, however appearances are against it, some great fundamental agreement in the Churches of Christendom. Divided as they are in government, in rites and ceremonies, and, in some points, doctrine—still essentially they must be one, even as they have one LORD and GOD, and one Baptism, and the same three great Creeds. So thought that good and holy man who, taking the lead in the *Tracts* from the beginning, brought them to a termination, in trying to express this idea in *Tract* 90.

This celebrated publication astounded the Church no less than the World, by a suggestion that very possibly the words which were used in the XXXIX Articles did not really convey, or mean to convey, that interpretation of doctrine which Protestants, as such, usually attached to them; that, looking to history and the circumstances under which they were drawn up, they might be interpreted in a much more Catholic sense than people suspected; and hence that the three divided Churches might be brought into much greater harmony than they appeared at present to be. "The object of the *Tract* was," Dr. Pusey informs us, "*to show that our Articles neither contradict any thing Catholic, nor are meant to condemn any thing in Early Christianity, even though not Catholic, but only the later definite system in the Church of Rome.*" (Pusey's *Letter to Jelf*, p. 5.)

And Dr. Newman himself, in his recent *Apologia*, shows what the animus was in writing it:—"A further motive which I had for my attempt was the desire to ascertain the ultimate points of contrariety between the Roman and the Anglican Creeds, and to make them as few as possible. I thought that each creed was obscured and misrepresented by a dominant circumambient 'Popery' and 'Protestantism.'" (*Apologia*, p. 160.)

"The *Tract* did not mean to deny that our Articles were, in a certain sense, a protest against the mediæval corruptions of *Popery;* it only meant to deny that they were, in any sense, an infringement of *Catholicity*, which was the point of blame at that time urged against them. It meant to say—*We might still be*

one, if only Rome would cease to bind us to that which was merely modern." (Pusey's *Letter to Jelf*, p. 5.)

But, strange to say, that at the same moment this was shown to be the case, the hope, even the prospect, that the Churches should ever be reunited was very slight indeed. The *Tract* seemed to be rather an intellectual struggle to demonstrate what might be, than to show any way in which it could be brought about. In Dr. Pusey's defence against the anonymous writer who attacked the *Tracts*, he quotes this very singular passage to show how very remote the idea then was of any unity:—"But, alas, *An Union is impossible!* Their [the Romanists'] Communion is infested with heterodoxy, we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of GOD'S truth, and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed. It cannot be reformed." (*Tracts, No.* 77, vol. iii. p. 9.) And in the same manner, in his *Letter to Jelf*, after reciting in the Appendix some of the objectionable tenets of Rome, as such, he concludes the whole thus:—"While these things are so, although we did not separate from Rome, yet since GOD has permitted that Rome should separate us from her, we see not how the Anglican Church could reunite with her without betraying the trust which she owes to her children." (*Letter to Jelf*, Appendix, p. 217.)

With such words as these, and with the difficulties of Reunion so prominently set out, the danger of *Tract* 90 must indeed have been chimerical. With the education of Oxford so thoroughly imbibing the Protestant interpretation of the Articles, what fear could there be that by a single publication, set forth by an individual, the whole mind of the Church was to be upset? But there is no place, or rather there was at that time no place, where the groove in which the mind runs is so very narrow as Oxford. And yet Oxford ought to have known that *Tract* 90 did in reality convey nothing new. It was not the first time that zealous hearts had panted to fulfil their LORD'S own blessed Prayer, that His Disciples might be one. Dupin on the Roman side, and Archbishop Wake on the English, had discussed the XXXIX Articles with the same view, i.e. to bring the Churches together, and Dr. Davenport, called "Sancta Clara" in his religious name, had in the reign of Charles I. laboured hard to effect a sufficient explanation of the Articles, that all might conform and join together under them[1]." How then, when

[1] *Sancta Clara on the Articles of the Anglican Church.* Edited by Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L.

all that *Tract* 90 attempted to do had been done already, could the outburst be justified which followed its publication? It was simply *the World* against *the Church*. Newman himself, in his own peculiar manner, speaks of it now as such:—"In the universal storm of indignation with which the *Tract* was received on its appearance, I recognize much of real religious feeling, much of honest and true principle, much of *straightforward, ignorant common sense.*"

But it was the end; it was the last of Newman in the English Church; and so he continues:—"I saw indeed clearly that my place in the movement was lost, public confidence was at an end, my occupation was gone. It was simply an impossibility that I could say any thing henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the Marshal on the buttery hatch of every college of my University, after the manner of discommoned pastry-cooks, and when in every part of the country . . . I was denounced as a traitor, who had laid his train, and was detected in the very act of firing it against the time-honoured Establishment." (*Apologia*, pp. 172, 173.)

Yes; his place in the movement was lost; but only for the moment. What if he had waited to see the issue—that issue which now stands upon the face of the whole Church, that Church which would have loved him as her leader at this very day, even as she loved him then, if only he had "abided in the ship?" Of what consequence the annoyance of a few Heads of Houses, and condemnation of local ephemeral authorities, terrified by an outside cry of the World? If he had but waited, what would he have seen? He would have seen that very *Tract*, then so ignominiously treated, reprinted[1] with honour and made a second time a study in parallel lines with Sancta Clara. He would have seen himself in correspondence with his former friend upon this very same work of peace—one engaged in an *Eirenicon* whose aim was the very same point, which then was perhaps too venturously advanced; and himself answering that friend in much the same spirit, though from an adverse position, and conceding much of which he would now gladly rid himself, in the new Communion to which too hurriedly he had fled. The Church of England, in great part as the result of *Tract* 90, is at the present moment struggling for, praying for, working towards Re-union more than ever. Railways and steam have carried the English people abroad, and brought the Roman and the Greek people to England. We have fraternized with all countries in Exhibitions and Crystal

[1] *A Preface, chiefly Historical, to Tract* 90 *of the Tracts for the Times, together with Tract* 90. By E. B. Pusey, D.D., 1865.

Palaces. We have courted each other in military shows of volunteers on both sides of the Channel. The Lord Mayor of London has been banqueted at Paris. It is no longer true of us that we are a John Bull caged up in an island, and have never seen any other phase of religion than the "Protestant Establishment." On the contrary, we have attended Mass in a hundred great cities of the Continent, and found out that there is not of necessity an idol in every foreign church; but that it is very possible to worship with a Roman priest, and not only to receive no harm but some good. In short, the prejudices, the obstinacies, the "ignorant common sense" of our people (save and except the Editor of the *Times* newspaper[1]), has disappeared, and we have come a little closer to the beauty of that which should describe us ever as disciples of CHRIST—*See how these Christians love one another!*

There is now a Society established throughout Christendom which embraces members of all the three different Churches. Bishops, priests, and laymen are united in it, and two volumes of sermons[2] have been published by members of the different Communions thus approaching each other in their common love. Dr. Pusey, who refers in 1841 to the fact that "an Union is impossible," now writes an *Eirenicon* to show how it may be brought about, and reiterates *Tract* 90 without fear of the Heads of Houses. He quotes from all sides to show the loving spirit in which the men of former ages have made the endeavour to bring about a Re-union. He urges that we may make it again. Here is a prayer taken from the Missal. It is a prayer for Unity, and may be thus rendered in our own language:—"O LORD JESU CHRIST, Who saidst unto Thine Apostles—Peace I leave with you, My Peace I give unto you; look not upon our sins, but on the faith of Thy Church; and grant her that Peace and Unity which is agreeable to Thy Will: Who livest and reignest, GOD, for ever and ever. Amen[2]." And this prayer we say (to use the word common to us all) in the Mass which we now offer in many places daily on our Altars. At all this the World stands aghast. It cannot comprehend what we mean, because the World is the representative of Satan, and cannot love Unity. The World's principle is as that of a great general, *Divide et impera:* the Church's principle is the reverse. What was thought and written to be impossible in 1833, or at least was dimly hinted at in 1841, and tried to be set forth in a

[1] Vide the *Times* newspaper and "S. G. O.," Oct., Nov., and Dec., 1866.

[2] *Sermons on the Re-union of Christendom.* By Members of the English, Roman, and Greek Churches (Two Series). Edited by the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L.

tentative spirit, is now brought within the bounds of a glorious realization. "This is indeed the LORD'S doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

Space will not permit any details of further points, illustrative of the progress of the Church since the time of the *Tracts for the Times*. But in a summary manner we may observe—1. On the Restoration of Religious Communities; 2. On the Revival of Church Architecture; and 3. On the Missionary Character of the Clergy.

1. As to Religious Communities.—Previous to the year 1833 there was not an idea of such a thing as possible, except in connexion with the Church of Rome. Dr. Pusey presided over the first at Plymouth, under the charge of Miss Sellon. What obstruction she had to encounter, what odium from the world, what outcries from Protestantism, all will remember. But all were gradually triumphed over by a stedfast perseverance in well-doing; until, after her example, devoted women from all parts have dedicated themselves in various ways to the same service. The great Penitentiary Convent at Clewer, built under, and solemnly consecrated by the Bishop of Oxford, is known to all. The Sisterhood at All Saints', under the Bishop of London, acting as Sisters of the Poor, is not less known. The holy women congregated together under the late deeply lamented Dr. Neale at East Grinstead are brought before us as nursing Sisters, whose benevolent love carries them all over the country in care of the sick. The Sisterhood of S. George's-in-the-East have lived through the storms of that unhappy parish, and have had opportunity of ample revenge on the misled populace by nursing them through the cholera of 1866, winning on all sides deserved admiration for their self-devoted love. Others there are in many towns, such as Brighton, Oxford, Wantage, Wymering, Horbury, and Froome, and many others daily springing up whose names are yet unknown. The Bishop of Chichester consecrated by a solemn form of induction, not long since, the Lady Warden of S. Michael's, Bognor, an institution for the education of girls of a higher order. The Brotherhood of the Order of S. Benedict has not indeed met with like success. This is perhaps owing to an overhasty indiscretion on the part of him who attempted what was beyond his strength; but the spirit and the will in the foundation of religious communities, even of men as well as women, is testified by that endeavour. There is no reason why self-sacrifice and abnegation of the world should not be in men as well as in women—no reason why the heads of the Church should not

give their sanction to the one as to the other. At any rate the idea is before us. It requires but a few more years, and GOD will put it into the heart of some noble and devoted man to begin the work—or rather to restore it—of monastic institutions.

2. The Revival of Church Architecture.—What were our churches at the commencement of the present century? Let any one remember the year 1833, and the churches built about that period. Let any one call back his mind to the thousand mutilations of the old churches of our fathers, and the desolations which met them at every turn; the galleries; the multiform boxes of the gentry and tradesmen; the drawing-room pew of the squire of the parish, with his sofa and his stove; the mildewed walls; the rotten timbers of the roof, through which the rain made its uninterrupted way. Even cathedrals, e. g. Lichfield, were filled with common church-boxes, and women sat promiscuously with the lay clerks and the clergy in seats which accommodated both, without respect of persons. The fonts were overthrown; the sanctuaries were desecrated. On the Altar at S. Paul's Cathedral, London, it was no uncommon thing to see hats and cloaks piled up, on occasion of great meetings, as though it were no more than a common table. Not a light was ever seen on a church Altar (seldom even now at cathedrals), not a vestment, not a single ornament of the Church existed, as though any thing proper were needed to show the love of CHRIST which constraineth us. But what a change! The *Tracts* were concluded in 1841. In 1843 the Camden Society arose, whose motto stands—*Donec Templa refeceris.* Just as the *Tracts* had prepared the way for the interior doctrine and discipline of the Church, so the Camden or Ecclesiological Society fulfilled it in its material demonstration. The Church at once rose up out of the mire, cathedral dignitaries awoke out of their slumbers, deans and chapters no longer fattened on the proceeds of their stalls. The old parishes would no longer permit the churchwarden jobberies by which the church-rates were squandered. The new churches springing up in every town display an architecture of which our forefathers would not be ashamed, while the old churches are restored with a loving care which shows that the Catholic Faith has not departed. The walls are decorated with frescoes and marble, as at All Saints', London. The windows are filled with glass of costly painting. Sculpture meets us once more with all its beautiful and touching memories; and the "Via Crucis" leads the thoughtful step of the traveller to the rood upon the porch, where CHRIST crucified is graven as in the olden times. Test all this by a visit to Worcester, Gloucester, Ely, Lichfield, and Wells; to S. Barnabas,

All Saints', and S. Alban's, London; to S. Mary Redcliffe, at Bristol; or to the new churches or restorations (amongst many more) at Leeds, Halifax, Brighton, and Froome.

3. The Missionary Character of the Clergy.—Yes; there is something far better even than architecture and all the beauties of æsthetic art. Rest only in æsthetic beauty, and the *Tracts for the Times* had done but little work. But there is by no means any resting there—on the contrary. Great dignitaries, with spacious palaces where they can never be seen, do indeed still exist. Church Commissioners, providing for the Bishop a nobleman's park at a convenient distance from the cathedral city, so that he may see as little of his people as may be, do still perform their miserable work. Rectories and vicarages snugly cared for and made suitable for wives and children, do still form a part of the "Establishment." But this is all passing away. The example has been set us of noble and self-denying men parting with all their comforts of life, not to say luxuries and extravagances, and in little bands and companies joining together for work in the populous and dense haunts of iniquity of our great towns. From the time of the *Tracts'* first publication, in which the ministerial work is set forth on the obligations of the Sacerdotal Office, Missions in populous parishes have gradually arisen. Mr. Lowder, issuing from S. Barnabas, and penetrating into the heathenism of S. George's-in-the-East, will explain the meaning of a Mission. It is this. One or two clergy, joined by some few laymen, work together by a common bond, and go forth with the blessing of the Bishop into the streets. They preach the Kingdom of God; they gather together whom they can in a room; they found a school; they make a congregation, and thus they compel the vilest of sinners to come in. How are they supported and maintained? By the offerings of the people—they want no more. Without lodging, without provision, without bread, save only that which God may send them day by day, or at furthest year by year, with only the Gospel in their hands, they advance into the haunts of Satan and bring out souls to be saved. Such a Mission was that of S. George's-in-the-East, which has now ended in a glorious church called S. Peter's, with a Sisterhood, a convalescent home, schools, and all the usual accompaniments of a parochial establishment. This Mission of S. George's-in-the-East has been followed by S. Alban's, Holborn, with a noble church, built and endowed at the sole cost of a merchant of the City of London. S. Alban's, Holborn! Thanks to the *Times* newspaper, we know enough of that name now—well abused and ridiculed in all its sacred and

laborious work, but winning the souls of the poor by thousands. And again, S. Michael's, Shoreditch, with its missionary priest, Mr. Lyford, issuing from S. Barnabas; and another, S. Gabriel's, Limehouse, under the charge of Mr. Baird. Again, S. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, springing from the church of All Saints in the person of Mr. West; and lastly, from the same church, the Mission of Mr. Gutch, of S. Cyprian's, in the parish of S. Mary-le-bone.

Now all these glorious works are evidently traceable to the *Tracts for the Times* of 1833. It is not meant that without the *Tracts* such works could not have been—but only this, that the connexion and following of the *Tracts'* teaching is evidently in them. Almighty GOD might have wrought in men's hearts the same work in another way. But this only we see, judging from cause to effect, the masters and the disciples, the one learning from the other, and as in Nature, so here, the Spiritual fruit arising from the Spiritual seed. They move on, they advance, they spread, as the mustard-seed and the vine, and so are known to be true, bearing in their increase the image and superscription of the Holy JESUS—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." If no missionary works such as these were heard of before 1833, or from that to 1841; if the other portions of the Church, not addicted to the *Tracts*, never performed, and still do not perform these works; if we do not hear of any other such devoted men abandoning the world, giving themselves up to a celibate life, denying themselves in all, save love of the souls of men, the inference is clear. We cannot but see it. It is what the World calls "Tractarian;" but it is in truth the vitality of the English Church burning with a flame of zeal which will cost the World and Satan no little trouble to extinguish. And this is a remarkable feature in the whole progress of the movement, not less singular than true—that out of all those churches and missions so outbidding each other in labours of love, *those make the greater progress who are nearest to the poor*. Blessed be GOD that it is so, for it is the surest sign of the solidity of the work. Observe how S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and S. Barnabas', Pimlico, though among the first churches of the western part of London, in setting forth the teaching of the *Tracts*, and though nobly and bravely bearing the brunt of the battle of the World from 1850 to 1857—first, in the voices of the mob under Lord John Russell, and then in the Courts of Law under Mr. Westerton—still, since that time, have made the least progress in advancing the Church order and ritual. And the same may be said of All Saints', Margaret Street. First in the

movement, when, in a poor misshapen room in Margaret Street, Mr. Oakeley presided over it, and the Catholic usages of the church drew crowds of worshippers to learn and to adore what then was a novelty; still, this church is equally remarkable with S. Paul's and S. Barnabas, for making no advance. They still hold great influence in the *World*, but they have lost it in the *Church*. Why is this? They are churches surrounded by wealth and by the aristocracy. Riches and rank exercise a baneful influence on the Church. They kill it with patronage; they lull it into sleep by over-security. The most excellent incumbents of these churches, most dear to the writer of this Paper, *want more poor to back them up*. It is the WORLD and its malign powers, its secret influence, its subtle fascination, its gross prejudice, which is too near, too ever present, too much mixed up with the circumstances overcharging all that is done; whereas at S. Alban's, Holborn, and S. Michael's, Shoreditch, and Christ Church, Clapham, and such like churches, there is no *World*, it is the *poor*, and according to the true sign of the MESSIAH, it is they who receive the chief prize in the fulness of the Church's blessing: for—"*To the poor the Gospel is preached.*"

No more need be said. The time is coming, and coming quickly, when class interests will have more power even than they have at present, when the aristocracy both of wealth and rank in this country will have to consider the aggression of the middle classes, and the middle classes the aggression of the working classes, and all will have to consider how best they may stave off the old revolutionary cry of Equality. The Press, in its ignorance of the working of religion in the human mind, and of the necessity for the working of religion, that there should be a Church whose priesthood are the friends of the poor; cry out against such churches as S. Alban's, describe its ritual observances as "pernicious nonsense," and would have the people believe that the true type of the Church of England is to be found in the be-cushioned pews of the proprietary chapels of the West End, or the comfortable lounging places of S. George's and S. James'. The *World* is tolerant of the *Church* so long as the latter merely shows herself as the servant, not as the master; so long as the "Establishment," as such, is uppermost, and not Religion; so long as the priest only believes and teaches as the Crown directs for the glory of the State. But if any power is gained in the affections of the *people*, exclusive of the authority of the State, and the voice of the Church is heard speaking independently from her pulpits and her Altars, then the

cry of the World is 'Popery,' and 'Priestcraft.' Now the World knows perfectly well that this is a mere bugbear. The World knows that the party in the Church which follows the teaching of the *Tracts* is the staunchest opponent of that part of Romanism which is not Catholic. From the first publication of the *Tracts* in 1833, down to the *Eirenicon* in 1865, the battle has been fought for the Catholicity of England, but never for, always against the peculiarities of Rome. The teaching has tended to the Unity of the Churches, but never with any compromise of truth. At first, when the *Tracts* were misunderstood and persecuted, when Heads of Houses in Oxford, and Bishops every where, hunted down those who were advancing Catholicity, and it seemed that the Church would never bear them, as more especially in the case of *Tract* 90; then indeed there was a constant stream of converts flowing over from one Church to the other, and men were alarmed. They threw all the blame upon the *Tracts;* whereas the blame was solely attributable to the opponents of the *Tracts.* Immediately that the way was opened, and in proportion as it was freely opened for the development of the *Tracts,* so have the conversions ceased. We never, or very rarely indeed, now hear of true Catholics forsaking the English Church, simply because now the ancient Catholic doctrines and the ancient Catholic usages have prevailed over all the outcries of Protestantism, and the Church is full of true faith, comparatively unfettered and comparatively free.

It is a mistake then—a mistake certainly in religion, but also a mistake in politics—that the World should abuse that portion of the Church which adheres to the teaching of the *Tracts.* It may be that the tocsin of democracy shall be sounded again among the people by such men as Mr. Bright, and those who are one with him; and the working classes shall rush out to assert their supposed rights against the aristocrat, the landlord and the master; and who then shall be found the readiest mediators and the nearest defenders of order to stave off Revolution? The rich are in the greater portion Protestants. The aristocracy are in the greater portion content with their sleek pews, and their seats in comfortable proprietary chapels; or at the very furthest, a haughty exclusiveness in S. James', Piccadilly, or S. George's, Hanover-square. What will they do? To whom will they look? Will it be their Bishops, their deans and chapters, all lodged comfortably in palaces equal to their own? Will it be their old-fashioned rectors settled down to their one day service for the week, who never see the people but from the pulpit? Or will it be the hard-working priests whose lives are spent among the poor;

who mix among them and are ever seen with them, in their schools and their parochial schemes of charitable love; who receive them for Confession, and direct them by daily spiritual guidance, and above all, who are offering at GOD'S Altar not the monthly but the Daily Sacrifice of the Church.

This then is a summary of some of the great results of the teaching of the *Tracts for the Times*. O ye princes and great ones of the World! O ye writers in newspapers, and speakers in the Houses of Parliament! beware, how ye are offended at the Church, when she moves thus downwards from your high estate to the lower portions of the people. Beware, lest haply ye be found fighting against GOD and against yourselves. Beware, lest by so doing ye be destroying the only safety which one day ye may need, when the cry shall come—"Set your houses in order." Check us not, therefore. Hinder us not. It would be for your own spiritual advantage if you would follow us yourselves, for there is much for you to learn; but certainly it is for your political advantage, and for that of the poor and the people that you let us alone. You may wonder at the externals of ornamentation which you behold at such a cost. You may despise our care for vestments, music, flowers, lights, or incense, and ridicule the desire which so widely prevails for Ritual Order. But know of a surety, that down below all this are deeper things than your philosophy has ever dreamt of—spirituality of life, holiness of self-denial, fidelity of doctrine, perseverance in good works, and altogether such gifts of the HOLY GHOST as prove the origin of the contest, as well as point steadily to the end, namely, though it may be indeed through much tribulation —the victory of JESUS in His Church over Satan and the World.

WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT.

Preachers and Preaching: the Pulpit and the Press.

It cannot but have been observed, that of late years, and, it may be said, only very lately, an antagonism has sprung up in certain portions of the Press against the Pulpit; on the part of editors against preachers; of writers of "leading articles" against the writers of sermons; of newspaper correspondents against evangelists. I speak of this antagonism as having arisen with the Press, because I do not think the Pulpit, if occasionally it have been put upon its defence, can fairly be charged with having been the aggressor. Two such powers as these cannot well afford to live on bad terms with one another, specially considering the many generations of good-will which have subsisted between them. Nevertheless, we are met by the fact of this spirit of antagonism towards the Pulpit on the side of the Press, in the present day—not of the Press as a whole, but in certain departments of it—and while the temper between the two lasts, and at the best can be described only as a condition of armed neutrality, on the side of the Press it every now and then breaks out into open attack. At dull seasons of the literary year, or at periods when the political hemisphere is not overcrowded with actions or agents, it is not an unusual practice for the journalists or the writers in magazines, in vexation at the distress for topics, to engage in an assault upon the prevalent style of Homiletics; and having no inclination or justification for calling to account the governmental "powers that be," to administer instead a castigation to the preacher, with the intention of convincing all whom it may concern, according to editorial notions, how little of a power he is. At the season, too, when the denizens of the metropolis, relaxing for a while their labours of head or hand, make their annual escape to the sea-side, or preferring rather not to go out of London into London, climb the hills, and thread the vales afar off, they are frequently pursued by their favourite prints, redolent of their condolence with an ill-used, but much-enduring "public,"

into their retirement among the mountains, or their marine publicity, for the sufferings they have had to undergo through the sermonic infliction during the weeks and months which have intervened since last they enjoyed the like liberty of the British subject.

With some of these literary issues of the faster and looser sort, not as to morals, but as to theological destructiveness, the whole question of preaching and hearing has been already judged and disposed of. The Pulpit is an institution which might advantageously be abolished. The Press is quite competent to discharge *its* functions and its own. To it, therefore, it would be quite as well if they were forthwith to be transferred. "Every man," from henceforth, instead of being "swift to hear," has simply to be swift to read; and the age, with its hurry, will take care that he shall read swiftly. Sermons are addresses which few sensible men pay any attention to. They may be submitted to, under protest, out of etiquette, while they remain; but the etiquette, at the risk of good manners, cannot last much longer. The discourses inflicted from time to time upon congregations exemplary for their patience, are, as to the majority of them, dull, dry, hard, tame exercises, operating as opiates on the sluggish, as irritants on the active-minded. These, and many more like words, in the way of chiding and remonstrance, are what the Church, "the Mother of us all," has to put up with from the wise "children of this world" in these days for "going into all the world," as she was told to do, and "preaching the Gospel to every creature."

To this off-handed dealing with the subject, before we proceed to treat it with greater particularity, we are entitled, and that without putting ourselves into the position of counsel for the defence, to offer an off-handed reply; and it is this: that howsoever inferior in quality the article called "Sermons" may be, the demand for the article is as great as, and greater than ever. A large proportion of the literature of every publishing season consists of volumes of sermons, honestly so called, and of other volumes, in which, though the name of "sermons" may be absent, the thing is there. Authors of volumes of the latter class, if they have recast their productions out of fear of literary critics, may be sure that by having done so they will not elude the vigilance of literary detectives. More sermons are called for than ever, more sermons are preached than ever, more sermons are listened to and by more listeners than ever, more sermons are published than ever, and more sermons must be read than ever. All this in the face of the outcry against them.

Sermons are published at seven shillings and sixpence, half-a-guinea, and twelve and sixpence a volume; and it must be supposed they sell, since it does not appear that whole editions find their way to the trunk-makers, or that quantities of them are sent off in sheets to the dealers in small wares. Tolerated annoyance that sermons are represented to be, people not only tolerate the annoyance in church, where, as say the editors piteously on their behalf, they cannot escape it; they welcome the annoyance where they can, and by the agency of the Press, which is so soon to usurp its functions, they enshrine the Pulpit in their homes.

The portion of the Press the least patient of preaching, except perhaps from the editorial chair, is that which is on the best terms with itself. I cannot but think there is not a little affectation in the outcry against sermons. There may be that which is agreeable to some minds in running down an ancient institution, because it is ancient, and in representing it as in its dotage, because it was not born yesterday. Preaching, which had the start of printing by so many hundreds of years, and which the world has never been wholly without, since the day that "the LORD GOD" Himself preached in Eden, though subsisting to a very late period without the Press, will doubtless last as long as the Church lasts, and that will be "to the end of the world." We must therefore make the best of it in spite of all its disadvantages; and if we can better its condition it is our bounden duty to do so. For do I say that the institution, as it has been transmitted to us, is perfect? Far from it. Do I say that the thousands of sermons that are delivered during the year are accomplishing a thousandth part of the results which might reasonably be expected from them? Far from that, too. Or do I say that our present system of preaching bears any due resemblance to an Apostolic, or a primitive model? Far from this, also. Writers need not indulge in the piteous lamentations they do as to the unsatisfactoriness of our science of Homiletics; preachers might save them the trouble. No class are more alive to that unsatisfactoriness, "if they would testify," than the preaching class; at least, those of the class whose testimony would be best entitled to reception. None can be more seriously or sadly impressed with a sense of the responsibilities, the difficulties, the discouragements of the preacher, and the misdirections, the fallibilities, and flatteries of preaching, than those who have for any length of time been engaged in the work; and on the principle that a victory in battle, on account of the miseries inseparable from it, is little less deplorable than a defeat, what the world might call a successful ministry has frequently been a source of

as much dissatisfaction to a minister, as one which in the judgment of the world might be pronounced an unsuccessful one. Few are there who for years have been ministers of GOD's Word who have not at some time or other felt the language of the prophet Jeremy rising to their lips—"Then I said, I will not make mention of Him, nor speak any more in His Name." And there the talk of their lips might have ended, but that they were constrained to add, as Jeremiah did—"But *His Word* was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not *stay*." And as men have been advised, when angry, to count ten before they speak, and if *very* angry, a hundred, I might, perhaps, be permitted to recommend my brethren of the Press, when, in an irascible mood, they feel an irresistible inclination to vent their displeasure against the unfortunate preacher, to read through the Book of the Lamentations of this prophet, before they take up their pens. And after this charge, let us go on to hear counsel for the plaintiff in this action.

A writer in the *Cornhill Magazine* for May, 1861, (and I go so far back for two reasons, one, that it may not be supposed that I, as a preacher, am wincing under some recent smart; the other, that the remonstrances of this writer are, on the whole, much more wisely conceived, and more courteously expressed, than many which have followed elsewhere,) thus introduces himself:—"I am suffering from sermons. This is my grievance. It is also yours, if you would only confess it, my patient and much-injured reader. Perhaps, you don't quite like to be reminded of it. You think it past hope, and past cure, and that therefore it is worse than useless to talk about it. Still, it must be some relief to know you have companions in affliction, who can, at least, offer sympathy; besides, you are not quite unprepared for the subject. We have all been reading about it lately a little more than usual. 'Low murmuring sounds,' like the first rising of a storm, might have been heard a month or two ago in all directions; newspapers had little paragraphs about it wedged into their spare corners, and popular names made short excursions into it from a philosophic point of view. The writers seemed to think that sermons had grown heavier than ever they were before, and that the thing had now nearly reached the limits of human patience; but no one seemed to know what was the remedy, or who was in fault." The writer is "suffering from sermons." Well, whether or not he be a sufferer from sermons, I know *I* am. Never was there a greater mistake than to suppose that hearers alone suffer from sermons; none suffer more from them than preachers. He tells the laity, indeed, that they "have companions in their afflictions,"

but leaves them to the conclusion, that such companions are unsermonizing folks like themselves. Could he put all these afflicted ones into some vessel, which might put into harbour, out of the reach of the coming storm, he would be astonished at the number of clergy he would find on board. If the people suffer from sermons, he little knows how much their manufacturers have to suffer from them. Keep where you are, my good critic; do not meditate, I pray you, changing places with *us*. If you wish us to vacate the pulpit, be it so; but unless you wish to increase your sufferings, leave it empty, rather than take to it yourself. Some of the afflictions to which its occupants are subject, may, perhaps, appear in the sequel. But the counsel proceeds:—"And who *is* in fault—the preachers or the people? I am about to demonstrate that the preachers and the people are both in fault, and to weigh out to each their due proportion of censure, as impartially as if Themis held the scales herself."

Most cordially do I agree with this conclusion, that both parties are in fault. Most gratifying is this exceptional admission, accustomed as one is to the asseveration that the clergy are always in fault, if any thing goes wrong. Leaving my learned friend and others to "weigh out his due proportion of censure" to the priests—and there will be no want of pleaders at that bar—I may by and by weigh out a portion of censure to the people; impartially, I hope, if, like him, I may not lay claim to a rectitude as rigid as that of the daughter of Cœlus. Some of the complainants, he said, "seemed to think sermons heavier than ever they were before." His own verdict is this—"In themselves sermons are no worse than they were before, and no better." This is rather bad news, if the saying be true, that "when things come to the worst they mend." If, up to the present time, after so many centuries, sermons be "neither worse nor better than they were before," it is a gloomy prospect for the plaintiffs, though a cheering one for the defendants, that they are never likely to come to the worst. Do what you will, you cannot get them to *that*. Though we might prefer excellence, taking the world as we find it, we need not be ashamed of mediocrity. "But," he adds, "the people are better," though the sermons be not. Right glad are we to hear it, and hope he will call witnesses; "that is to say, they expect something better than their grandfathers expected." Here I cannot but join issue with this writer. By no means can I agree with him that "sermons are no worse than they were before, and no better." Whether this be the case or not with the spiritual physicians at whose hands this patient seems to have suffered so much, I have no way of

knowing. Speaking generally, I feel confident that sermons are better, or that there is a vast increase of better sermons than before. Instead of the sermons of the last century, many of which sustained as little practical relation to the inhabitants of the earth, as, if she have any, of the moon—occupied as they extensively were with dry disquisitions on the attributes of God (how thankful we ought to be that the vile trisyllable has nearly died out!) to the oblivion of the duties of men—or with the evidences of a Christianity from which was eliminated almost every thing that was distinctively Christian—numbers of terse, direct, vigorous, useful, practical, and, in the highest sense, evangelical, sermons are delivered in the present day, if people will but hear them. But this is the question. Here, again, I cannot but correct a notion, which, to judge from their manner of speech who arraign the ordinary run of sermons, we should suppose could not lie open to correction. The complainants in this suit seem invariably to assume, that wheresoever, in their vague parlance, there is "a good preacher," he will be sure to be followed by a crowd eager to receive his message. Facts, however, have never warranted this inference. Those who draw it pay a compliment in so doing rather to the people's discernment than to the preacher's desert. It is akin to the homage which people pay to their own wisdom rather than to the "Wisdom of God," when they tell us how easy of comprehension those Scriptures are which were "given by His Inspiration." Some of the best preachers, and by the adjective is intended, thoughtful, careful, well-informed, spiritually-minded, preachers, preachers whose message is every way calculated to do good—really to make people better—have at all times been liable to have comparatively few hearers. I could cite examples, were I at liberty to do it, both in the Church and among those unattached, who have that to deliver, which it would be highly profitable, if not for all people, yet for their own, to receive, who are honoured with but a very meagre following. Their auditors may be fit, but they are few. These are preachers of whom persons, on a first hearing, may think but little, yea, may go away disappointed. The truth is, it requires a kind of education at their feet to be enabled to appreciate them. To the "dull of hearing" they are deficient, because they do not make enough of noise. Set one of such preachers to address a congregation accustomed to a decidedly inferior article, which they are in the habit of considering superfine, and the probability is, that they will yawn, turn over their hymn-books, count their fingers, look at their watches, during the former half of his discourse, and

quietly subside into somnolence for the latter half. On the other hand, to those who "ponder these things," it is a subject of astonishment what crowds frequent the prelections of men who would not possess a single recommendation with any one gifted with "spiritual discernment." Many of the gifted preachers among us could afford to bear the general onslaught upon sermons with much equanimity, if they were aware what style of declaimers they are to whom the multitude, up in arms, delight to listen. So long as the best preachers are not the best supported by the presence of receptive disciples, people may as well cease to complain about sermons.

But returning to our particular complainant, we do not find that he has any very specific remedy to propose for his complaint. He goes on to protest strongly against the division of the sermon into heads; against the stretching of a discourse on the rack of one of Mr. Simeon's skeletons; but, above all, against the infliction upon a Christian assembly of a lithographed homily, procured from a gentleman who advertises, "To Clergymen," informing them that "the strictest secresy may be relied on," and which was actually inflicted upon such an assembly, by a divine who "relied upon the secresy" so "strictly," as to imagine that himself alone had been privileged to purchase the precious document: and thinking its delivery might have created a sensation, on inquiry of the sexton, after the service, how it was liked, received for his answer—"Oh, very much, indeed, sir, we *always* liked that sermon." From these revelations we cannot but conclude that complainant must have fallen into very indifferent hands in the matter of sermons; or, to speak in plain English, must have "fallen among *thieves*," and must have been as severe a sufferer from sermons as he describes himself to have been. As such, we offer him our unaffected condolences, having ourselves, a few years since, been affrighted by the appearance of one of Simeon's skeletons, and the same, in two different places, on the same Sunday; and convinced, as we are, that no one in any way connected with this volume can have been the author of his wrongs. He sums up his pleadings on this wise:—"Our venerated teachers must not take it as an insult, that we should presume to offer them some hints here; they ought to teach us. Perhaps it is not wholesome to be always teaching others." Certainly not, if "he that teaches others teacheth not himself." "And is it not possible that in this way they may hear of something to their advantage? When Benedict overheard his friends take him down as he lay in the bushes, instead of making it an insult, he wisely reflected on the happiness of those that can 'hear their detractions,

and put them to mending.' Besides, it is asking no more than simple justice, nor as much. All the year round they have the parole, and we must listen in silence. Whatever we may think in church, we cannot speak. The heaviest Mede and Persian in the kingdom (i. e., as before explained, he whose cry is *nolumus leges Pulpiti mutari*, in the matter of divisions), is lord of his own pulpit. It is his castle, and we cannot eject him to put him into a pew, and have our turn at lecturing him. We must either take it out in print, or let it alone. It is not much to ask them for once to change places with us." In how many cases, my good friend, do you suppose we should get asked *more* than once? "Even the slaves at Rome were allowed as much. Once in the year they might tell their masters what they thought of them. It is a hard case, if, in the land of freedom, we cannot claim a privilege which those heathen tyrants granted without asking." The hardship complained of seems to be that the laity have not an occasional liberty of reply. The clergy, peradventure, might be disposed to grant such liberty, on condition that they had leave, now and then, to examine the laity as to the state of their Christian knowledge; occasionally to catechise adults as well as children. From specimens of that knowledge which at times come into their possession, without having been extorted by catechising, some singular disclosures might be expected. The arrangement for this liberty of reply on the people's part would be a somewhat awkward one, should it happen to include questions of morals as well as doctrine, and the ambassador of the Most High should fall into the hands of a casuist, such as the writer once heard of, who, being asked, on his return from church, what he thought of the preacher who had been solemnly denouncing a palpable sin, made answer—"Ah! very good, no doubt; but he had it all his own way up there."

On the whole, in taking leave of our clever remonstrant, I cannot but say I should be rather loath to intrust the reformation of the pulpit to any occupant of a *pew*, or to any one who could be so unmerciful as to incarcerate me in a pew while he "had his turn at lecturing me." Fancy a member of the Association for Promoting the Freedom of Worship being subjected to such an indignity! This introduction of the pew, wherein, I hope, during the sermon, our friend did not divert himself by writing his article, is unfortunate. It provokes the suspicion, that if Homiletic reform is to arise from the suggestions of pew-holders, our sermons will indeed be no better, but worse than before; and that a race of preachers will be let loose among us who will deserve to be remitted to a much more serious capti-

vity than that of the narrowest pew that was ever constructed by a craftsman with the most inveterate aversion to bended knees.

I would not say that there is no such thing as a bad sermon, but only that no one ever heard of such a thing. All sermons are eloquent, excellent, admirable, &c., when returned thanks for post-prandially, when requested to be published, or when epitomised singly by the prints which corporately run them down. Neither do I say that because sermons may be good in the abstract they have no evil in the concrete. Many bad sermons there are, but, strange to say, it would be very difficult to elicit from their hearers any consentient account wherein their badness consisted. "That beautiful Word of God," exclaims Eugénie de Guérin, "how disfigured it gets in passing through certain lips! One needs to know beforehand that it comes from Heaven." In the matter of sermons more than in most other matters, persons are prone to call "evil good, and good evil." There are comparatively few in ordinary congregations who can separate the substance of a sermon from its accidents, and if the latter be agreeable, the former is too probably ignored. The *what* of the sermon is with too many of less importance than the *how;* a lesson to preachers who have the *what,* that they should cultivate the *how.* I have listened to what would be considered bad sermons which have done me good; I have listened to what would be considered good sermons which have done me harm. The worst sermons are those that do *no* good, but they may get ranked among the best, if the hearer had rather that the sermon should *not* do him good. A lady of mature age that I recollect, was in the habit of walking five miles on the first day of every week to hear one who, it must be confessed, was a very painful preacher, and she had the church all but to herself; but, said she, "his preaching does me good:" and from that there was no appeal. But this is not the usual mode of judging. Preachers who "do well unto themselves" are quite as much followed as those that do good to others. The goodness or the badness of a sermon thus depends altogether upon the standard to which it is brought. A good sermon, if brought to a bad standard, will have no chance. Where a preacher manifests that he is more occupied with the thought of himself than of his subject, when his manner indicates that he thinks quite as much of himself as, if not more than, any one else can think of him, or if his gesture declare that what notion soever others may entertain about him, his opinion about himself has been long ago made up, and is not likely to be altered—"though he speak with the tongues of men

and of angels"—the whole thing is bad from beginning to end. Yet, it is not at all uncommon to find ecclesiastical demagogues attracting large congregations, and apparently to a large extent, by the very foibles in their characters, which "were their subjects wise," ought to repulse them. "A vain preacher," saith a late number of a *Congregational Review*, "is a nuisance, nothing more; paid, too, for becoming so."

Another writer in the aforenamed *Cornhill Magazine* for June, 1864, or he may be the same, judging from some similarity of complaint, except that the complaints of those in general who revenge through the Press the wrongs, real or imaginary, inflicted upon them by the Pulpit, run much in the same strain, says:—"Look at each sermon by itself, and you cannot say that it makes much difference whether it is preached or not." What! not to the preacher? "It may make such a difference, or it may not; but it is a matter of conjecture. It is a shot fired at random—a stone thrown in the dark." Rather provoking this. To have so little made of one's sermon is enough to instigate a predicator who thinks much of it, to the retort, that, look at each number in itself, and you cannot say it makes much difference whether the *Cornhill Magazine* be duly published once a month or not. The preacher, however, who is himself a sufferer from sermons, will be the last by "grievous words" to "stir up" editorial "anger;" and I cannot but suspect that this representation of the deliverance or the non-deliverance of sermons, as making little or no difference in numberless instances, except to the preacher, or to sundry people who would, the sermon not being preached, be deprived of a sermon to find fault with, is but too true. It would be a terrible humiliation to many of the orators on Sunday to know how many of their orations are forgotten by Monday morning. Still, it comes to the same point as before, that there is fault upon both sides; assuredly upon one. It can make no difference whether the sermon is preached or not, if it be preached to a people who are resolved that either way it *shall* make no difference. It *can* make no difference, if, no matter what the preacher *says*, the people's minds are made up not to *do*. Having in view only those sermons that have a fair chance of being beneficial, many a sermon is but as "a shot fired at random," because those for whom the shot was intended dexterously got out of its way. When the cap fits best, the "dear hearer" is most likely to put it upon his neighbour's head instead of his own. And another thing which preachers have observed, which hearers have not, is, that if the pastor have prepared a discourse for the

special "reproof, correction, or instruction in righteousness," of certain members of the flock, it is all but sure to happen that on that particular occasion, something quite unexpectedly or unavoidably intervenes to prevent the attendance of those members at church. If any one say, it serves the preachers right for intending to be personal, I ask—How can preaching be of any use if it be *not* personal? If what was intended for one class of hearers be transferred to another, it might as well have been intended for neither.

In another part of the remonstrance with which we are at present concerned, we read as follows:—"It is certain that the common run of sermons can never have been much better or much worse than they now are"—this looks very much like the acquaintance we lately parted with, does he not?—"and it is curious that people should be surprised at their quality. The sermon is to last half an hour"—for what reason, who can tell, save that "people love to have it so," else the writer has been a maker of sermons of all lengths, from seven minutes to over the hour—"and there are to be two a week." Not, my good critic, according to the rule of the "Established Church:" but of this, more anon. "Any ordinary sermon would, if printed, fill, perhaps, ten pages of this Magazine, and thus the sermons of two clergymen preaching twice every Sunday for a month would fill a number, and fill it with general reflections on religion and morality." A pretty dry number of the Magazine, methinks that would be, if this were the average description of the sermons that would fill it. "Is there any one in England," he proceeds, "however brilliant, profound, or learned, who could produce that amount of original matter for any length of time, if he gave up his whole mind to the composition of the sermons, and to the reading necessary to produce them? Probably no one could do it for a year; but to suppose that some 20,000 people will go on doing it for all the years of their life, is to indulge a hope which is altogether chimerical. The truth is, that not one man in a thousand is capable of making interesting reflections at all. Any ordinary conversation turns almost entirely upon facts, and upon observations or arguments about them." I trust our friend has not forgotten how largely Christianity is a religion of *facts*. "If a man does diverge into generalities, it is rarely possible to listen to him with satisfaction; yet with regard to the clergy it is expected, that they should be able constantly to produce matter worth attending to at a rate at which the greatest genius could hardly produce it, and in relation to a subject which nothing but genius can handle

in such a manner as to command attention. The really remarkable point about sermons is that there are so many preachers who do succeed in getting a certain kind of attention from their hearers," (inattentive attention, I suppose) "and in exercising a perceptible influence over many of their minds."

Passing by much that is objectionable in this paragraph, must it not be said that our *Cornhill* contributor has here gone to the root of the matter? It is here conceded, that more is expected from a clergyman in the way of sermons than is to be expected from any man; and yet not more than the generality of congregations go on, year after year, expecting. The people need not complain that the clergy constrain them to excessive hearing; the clergy may as fairly complain that the people subject them to excessive talking. It comes to this point, then—Is there not too much preaching in the present day; and if there be too much preaching, are there not, this demand having to be met, too many preachers? Less preaching would necessitate fewer preachers, and we might be gainers by the diminution in both cases. *Non omnia possumus omnes.* While the Church continues to expect every *man* in her service to be able to do every *thing*, she must not wonder that large departments of her work get but indifferently done, and especially the department of preaching, if by preaching other departments of her work are to be helped forward. If it be necessary for every preacher to be a priest, which is not at all certain, it is not necessary that every priest should be a preacher. Common sense would dictate that those, as a rule, should be called upon to preach who have some sort of vocation for preaching; but this cannot be, so long as sermons are so many. The present multiplicity of sermons calls into requisition as a preacher every one who has the licence to open his mouth. We may affirm without hesitation that there is too much preaching in these our days, far more than can be good either for preachers or hearers. And no one party (I beg pardon for using so objectionable a term) seems to me more to blame for this unconscionable excess of concionation than another. In the early days of the revival of Church Principles among us there was a strong reaction against the preponderance and undue importance of sermonising. Looking back on those days, I cannot but think that the reaction was too violent, and that to this fact we owe it, that Church Principles failed to take root in many places where efforts were first made to plant them. In such places, these principles have survived only in the breast of the pastor, who has gone on declaring them, perhaps, by word of mouth, to this hour, but without any adjuncts which could

assist their reception on the part of the people. For among other singular phenomena, those who have to deal with human souls in the ministration of God's Word, cannot but have noticed this, to wit, the ingenuity with which persons select from their message what truths they choose to receive, and what truths they choose to reject: yea, that the very truths against which they have made up their minds, though continually enunciated in their presence, may not in the slightest degree affect them, unless some significant changes in the direction of these truths in the order of Divine Service should render such truths disagreeably intrusive. It is very curious, but so it is, that with many churchgoers, a man might preach Calvinism in a chasuble or a surplice, and they would declare it to be Romanism; while he might preach Romanism in a Genevan gown, and it would not be distinguished from Calvinism.

But in those early days of the "Movement" did not we verily suffer from painful preaching—from the preaching of Baptismal Regeneration pushed all but to an heretical extreme—from the preaching of the high prerogatives of the priesthood by young divines who had just completed their diaconate—from the preaching of the powers of the Church in the presence of vestrymen who had cut off all the necessaries from the house of God—and from *their* preaching who were so smitten with a love of monotone that they monotoned the sermon as well as the Office—and when the discourse, if intended to reach the heart, by the infamous unmethod of its delivery, was all but literally thrown at one's head;—and the worst of it was, that those who had never been tempted to over-estimate the sermon had to suffer quite as much as those who had. Their only consolation must have been in the reflection, that in all unavoidable revolutions the innocent suffer with the guilty. That was the time when such as were unable to preach saved their credit by expressing their conscientious objections to sermons, and those who had an inveterate indisposition to write sermons covered their retreat by decrying the prevalent taste for preaching. It is a wonder that the cause survived the force of the reaction. The reaction itself has since been as forcibly reacted upon, and if there be an excess of preaching now, Churchmen are fully as answerable for that excess as any one else. Who, for instance, can enter into the rationale of octaves of sermons, on a variety of topics, unannounced beforehand, by various preachers, of varied attainments, and different constitutions of mind; or by some who are really preachers, and by others who are simply partisans, the sermons having no connexion with each other, appropriate to

the occasion, as the case may be, or inappropriate; some written, some unwritten, some from notes, some without notes, some extempore, some memoriter, some prepared, some unprepared, some newly composed, some from an old stock—now so prevalent among us, and resting their propriety upon all manner of excuses? In the days when the importance of preaching had reached its utmost exaggeration, folks did not dream of as many as seven, nine, or fifteen sermons a week. Surely people cannot be very particular about the quality of the article who order such a quantity of it as this. Nothing goes beyond it that I am aware of, except the practice among the Revivalists of Wales, of holding three services in the day, with three sermons at each service. But Wales, since her defection from the Church, owing chiefly to the appointment of Bishops who understood not her mother tongue, and who had not, like the present Bishop of S. David's, the ability or the conscientiousness to acquire it, has always been a preaching country; and this is what the Cambrians call "a power of preaching:" but the power of hearing that must be brought to meet it must be still more wonderful.

A number of sermons upon subjects previously announced, though by a variety of men, has more to be said in its favour—a number of sermons on the *same* subject, though by a variety of men, still more—but a number of sermons on the same subject, by the same man, treating the subject in all its bearings, far more. The results which we may believe have followed the discourses of Mr. Carter, at All Saints, Margaret-street, during Lent, which have been a carrying out of the third of these methods, ought to justify the adoption of the plan elsewhere. Nor is it possible to believe but that the Oxford sermons, delivered during the same season, under the direction of the Bishop of the Diocese, which have carried out the second, have borne ample fruit. Nevertheless, the difficulties do not lie with preachers occasionally in churches other than their own, with preachers on State occasions, with the occupants of University pulpits, with Academic lecturers, Bampton, Hulsean, or what not, but with the two men, and, in how many hundreds of instances, the *one* man, who has to preach all the year round, in the same church, to the same people, and is expected to preach twice in the day. To suppose that any man, at a given time every Sunday morning, and at a given time every Sunday afternoon, under any circumstances of mind or body, with head-ache, heart-ache, tooth-ache, ear-ache, with biliousness, nervousness, dyspepsia, neuralgia, (and the writer has known many a member of the ministerial order who has had to go through his appointed

task under one or another of these drawbacks, with the conviction too painfully brought home to him, being single-handed in his parish, that in senses beside the matrimonial "it is not good for a man to be alone,") can be prepared with a homily throughout the year, which shall at once interest all his people, and approve itself to the taste, it may be, of some theological dyspeptic who may happen to get among them, is preposterous. But it is to be recollected that among these pastors scattered throughout the kingdom there must be many to whom the preparation of sermons is little short of a disgust. They have a positive distaste for this part of their work, though liking other portions of their work as much as any of their brethren, and doing those portions of it thoroughly well. They have not the vocation of the preacher, no gift of preaching has been bestowed upon them, (for preachers, like poets, are born rather than made) and feeling, as they do, that it is so, is it not a hardship that they should be compelled to preach, and to preach as frequently as if their capabilities all lay in that direction, and the preparation for the pulpit came most natural to them and easy? There have been excellent and useful men to whom the composition of discourses has been a sort of nightmare of their existence, the only obligation they ever procrastinated, which they have invariably put off to the last moment, and which at the last moment has been incomplete. Approaching the exercise with reluctance, they have experienced a signal relief when it was over. The sermon-critic would probably say such persons ought never to have been ordained. We cannot agree with him, because the sermon is not the chief, still less the only feature of the ministerial office; but we say that for their own sake, and the people's, it is a pity they could not be absolved from the responsibility of preaching. It need not be said that the preaching of such persons is seldom effective, for several concomitants concur to hinder or to promote the efficiency of sermons, of which neither preachers nor hearers may take sufficient account, or of which both may be ignorant. A sermon which has been uncomfortably prepared will most likely be uncomfortably delivered, and is very likely to be uncomfortably received. He who has been ill at ease in his study will be ill at ease, it is highly probable, in his church. The fidgety preacher will make the people fidgety, and he whose preaching is painful to himself will surround his congregation with thorns. And withal, the preacher under such circumstances becomes in the pulpit formal and awkward, assuming there a voice and manner which he never assumes any where else; in fact, may become altogether unnatural, and go on to mistake his being so

for something præternatural. No one knows how largely the message of salvation has been hindered by this unnaturalism of preachers, or how continually the impression is left upon people, to be fostered by the enemy of their souls, when they see how unlike himself the minister of CHRIST is when he ought to be most like, that he is but playing a part.

And though it may seem trifling, it is by no means so, if I allude, in this connexion, to the too general uncomfortableness of pulpits. It is amazing that the incumbents of churches should submit, as they do, to the inconvenient posts of entreaty from which they deliver themselves. I should suppose that there are few preachers who are much in the habit of addressing the congregations of their brethren who have not been companions with the writer in this tribulation. A pulpit at its best estate is an ungainly erection, which has seldom to be thanked for its assistance to the profitableness of the discourse; but why its construction and its accessories should make it more disagreeable, who can tell? There is such an expression as "being at home" in the pulpit, but he must have an odd notion of home who should take it from the generality of pulpits. Too many are the preachers, upon whose breasts, so long as they occupy such pulpits, you might write the inscription, "Not at home." As soon as one gets into them one begins to get anxious for the time to arrive to get out of them again: tall pulpits made for short men, dwarf pulpits made for tall men, the book-board quite flat, or with its angle not sharp enough, or too sharp—obtruding itself too much inwards, or extruding itself too much outwards—the light at Even-song, when the larger proportion of homilies are delivered, too dim, or too dazzling, furnished here by a flaring gas-jet, there by a candle little better than a rushlight—in one place, coming into unpleasant proximity to your cheek, in another, located so as to illuminate your back, in another, so as to fall upon your head, in all, so as to fall any where but, if you have one, on your manuscript —and added to all, perhaps, a rickety apparatus under foot, whereby your equilibrium is momentarily endangered, unless you preserve the immobility of a statue—these things, which look like, are indeed no trifles, and have frequently deprived the best adapted discourse of its legitimate effect upon those for whom it was intended.

But not only do they become weary of sermons, who "speak unto the people" under manifold disadvantages, or who have no particular qualification for this department of ministerial work; those, too, who are well qualified for it, and have been successful

in it, are apt sooner or later to get out of heart with it. This arises from the excess of preaching, coupled with the paucity of results, compared with its amount. Fewer sermons must be the remedy. Can any thing be more supererogatory than the delivery of two sermons in the day to the same congregation? What can possibly happen to one of them, but that it shall fade from the memory of the hearers, not by Monday morning, but before Sunday night? And if, of two sermons, one of them be thus likely to be lost upon the people, is it not better that there should be but one, in the hope that it may be retained? There is something to be said for two sermons in the day, in the same place, if they be addressed to two congregations; but even in this case, one useful discourse might be preferable for both. It would thus be *the* sermon for the day, and being but one it would have every chance of being the more carefully prepared; whereas, we at present speak rather of *a* sermon than of *the* sermon, as if we would add to the indefinite article more than its full complement of indefiniteness, if we do not throw into it a measure of contempt. And in thus advocating a reduction in the number of sermons, I speak of the sermon specifically so designated, distinguished from other less formal or less public methods of instruction. In some parishes there are even *three* sermons in the day, but seldom by the same preacher, though this continually happens with the two. The three sermons make catechising, which is more difficult than preaching, and requires a special gift, impossible, though by the 59th Canon it is made a duty so binding upon the clergy. Whether there be two sermons, however, in the same parish, or three, and though there may be a different congregation to attend upon each, there will, there may, or there must be, some in each congregation who hear, it cannot be said, heed, them all—the officials of the House of God, for instance—or some who out of choice frequent them, who, one might imagine, must conceive that they will be saved for their much hearing—or, perhaps, the children, clothed and educated at the parochial expense, "with their satchels," (and if with "shining morning face," with faces not particularly shining at nine of the clock at night) "creeping like snail, unwillingly to" *church*. Can this be what the Baptismal Office intended by exhorting their sponsors to "call upon them to hear sermons"? and is it to be wondered at, that so many of these children, after they grow up, avoid hearing a sermon again—if, indeed, they have not been stowed away during these sermons which it is assumed they have heard, in far-off galleries and odd corners of the sacred edifice where they could neither hear nor see?

Then as to the congregation—what would be thought of any one who was in the habit periodically of listening to two or three lectures in the same day, on subjects other than theological —archæological for the first, anthropological for a second, geological for a third? It will be said, probably, that three lectures on subjects such as these would require far more attention on the part of him who resorted to them than three sermons, filled with what our friend would call, "general reflections on religion and morality." Be it so; if sermons require less attention than discourses on other subjects, that is a reason why less frequent attendance on sermons should be demanded. These two or three sermons in the same day, if they call together some unwilling hearers, necessitate the employment of many inefficient preachers. "The LORD gave the Word;" that will be true for ever and ever: but never was it truer than now, that "great is the company of the preachers." Considering our number of sermons, it might be supposed that the latter part of the Apostle's sentence in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. ix. 16, had been incorrectly rendered; that he had taught every one upon whom a Bishop lays hands, to say to himself, "Woe is unto me if I preach not." Doubtless there are preachers, to whom instead of its being said, "Woe is unto you if you do *not* preach," it might rather be said, "Woe is unto your hearers if you *do*." What the Apostle saith is, "Woe is unto us all, if, when we preach, we preach not the Gospel!"

Perhaps, one of the most serious detractions from the usefulness of sermons, is, their fragmentary character. Each sermon, as a rule, is complete in itself; having little or no connexion with any other, beyond its being a sermon. I cannot but think that this insulated system of preaching has deprived sermons of much of their benefit. Whether or not the clergy be chiefly to blame for this, the people seem to be thoroughly habituated to it. No one would dream of catechising on the principle that the instruction given on a present occasion need have no link of dependence upon that given on a previous one. This instruction by sermons, each of which is regarded as complete in itself, is injurious to congregations in more ways than one. The preacher who proceeds upon this plan ought never to have a congregation such as that contemplated by one of the prophets, among whom, "precept must be upon precept, line upon line, here a little, and there a little." The notion that each sermon is complete in itself, leads "the unlearned and unstable" to conclude, that the service on each Sunday in the year is the same—that there is no cycle—but that the Epistles and Gospels were

picked at random at the Reformation. It encourages irregularity of attendance, under the idea that missing the service on one Sunday is no more than missing it on any other, and keeps the people contented with that picking and choosing in matters of believing and doing which are so prevalent. Any permanent improvement in this respect would be a task of immense difficulty. Any pastor who, among his own people (and he can preach separate sermons elsewhere), should set this insulated system of instruction aside, and take to delivering serial discourses, (and for this reason they might be the shorter, which might be a gain,) with a view of imparting to them a thorough acquaintance with one subject at a time, might find that it would be some while before he could bring them to understand, still less to appreciate, his motive in so doing, or to see that attendance upon one such discourse necessitated attendance upon all. The method recommended would, no doubt, involve the clergy in more labour than the separate sermon, and require from their flocks a more careful attention; but, while by this method, the sermons would be fewer and shorter, their beneficial effects would be more manifold and last the longer. One bad sermon, if there be such a thing, is a sermon too many on the Sunday; two good ones would also be one too many: one good sermon, if all the people could be brought together to hear it, if not, let it be delivered, like an Episcopal charge, more than once, is enough. If otherwise, let catechising make up the deficiency.

But, I fear, the people like best to have things as they are. They expect two sermons in the day. Some attend upon two, with what advantage is best known to themselves; some prefer limiting their attendance to one; others think it hard unless there be three, that they may choose whether of the three they will attend. If the clergy do not oblige them, and bark not for two or three hours "on the first day of the week," they may perchance be abused as "dumb dogs." Meanwhile, the writer is sorry to be obliged to add, that this demand for sermons is not always accompanied by any thing like a due consideration of the wear and tear of their manufacturers. The thing produced, good, bad, or indifferent, they behold; the process which produced it, they do not. On this point, I may avail myself of the following plain-spoken, though not uncalled-for remarks of an American theologian, Dr. Nicholas Murray. Saith he:— "Persons generally have no idea of mental labour. They know it takes some time to make a pair of shoes, or a hat, or a coat, or a table, or to plough a field, or to build a shed; but they have no idea of the time or labour it requires to prepare a good

sermon. As it may be preached in forty or fifty minutes, they suppose it may be prepared in twice the time. They think that a pastor has little to do who prepares only two sermons a week, and preaches them on the Sunday. They know all about physical labour, but nothing about mental. They know something about raising a heavy weight, but they know nothing about the construction of an argument, or the refutation of a popular or plausible error, or the placing of a controverted truth in a light which convinces all. In fine, the multitude have no conception of mental labour; and hence people are so reckless as to squandering the time of their minister." I have often heard over-tasked clergymen of large districts declare, that unless they ran away from the parish, they scarcely ever knew what it was to have an hour that they could call their own; the most thorough "servants of all work" in the neighbourhood: yet their congregations, of course, did not expect from them indifferent sermons. "Merchants," saith he again, "and bankers, and lawyers, and mechanics, have their daily hours of business; none think of interrupting them during those hours: if any do, they have to call again." "Why," he asks, "should not the ministers of CHRIST be left to their regular hours? Why should parish loungers come to their study in the morning at nine o'clock, and as they are going away at twelve, apologize for the intrusion by saying, 'I hope I have not interrupted you?'" "It requires," saith he again, "time to do any thing well; and if a people desire a pastor to be 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed,' they must spare his time."

So far from its being necessary that there should be three sermons on the Sunday, or two, or even one, it might sometimes be advisable there should be none. It is related of a noted Nonconformist in the metropolis, that tidings reached his ear that it was considered he had not sufficiently visited his people. Determining to nip these complaints in the bud, he accordingly, on a certain Monday morning, hired a cab, or, belonging to the aristocracy of Dissent, it may have been some less ignoble vehicle, or called his own equipage, and for the rest of the week spent his time between the carriage and the houses of the various members. On the next Sunday morning, from the pulpit he apprised the people of what he had done, and added, "Under the circumstances you cannot, of course, expect that I am come hither to-day prepared with a sermon. Let us pray." Is it not a hard case that the hard-working incumbent of some over-taxing Metropolitan parish could not occasionally "go and do likewise"?—that he could not at the proper place in the

service, address the people now and then on this wise, and say, "Dearly beloved, I have nothing particular to communicate to you at this time—no particular point to which I desire to solicit your attention; let us fix our thoughts upon CHRIST, and proceed with the Divine Office?" Would not any man, when he assayed to speak in the LORD'S Name, be listened to with the more reverent regard, if, instead of saying something because he had to preach, it were well known he could never be prevailed upon to preach unless he had something to say?

Our friend of the *Cornhill*, as we may have perceived, speaks apologetically for the clergy, intimating in the extract that has been made, that the average of sermons is as good as can be expected, considering the number of them which they have to preach; or, as he intimates elsewhere, considering the amount of other work, though attaching no great importance to any of it, which they have to do. He expresses his sympathy for the ministers of the Church, assuring them that "men are usually reasonably considerate;" that "they pitch their expectations at a rational level, and make allowances for a class which is certainly placed under great difficulties." He commiserates good men who have to be "engaged in a whole network of schemes for the general improvement of the parish in which they live; who are full of a mass of small engagements, which cut their day to pieces, and dissipate their minds even more than they disturb their leisure." How kind this is! How shall we express our acknowledgments? It is all true; and none know it better than the clergy. There *is* "a mass of engagements," whether "small" or not depends upon what comes of them rather than upon the engagements themselves, which fall to their lot, which might be much lightened if they were shared by others. Though in the case of an individual clergyman they may be indefinitely multiplied from an undue notion of centralization in himself, under the idea that every thing that is done in his parish must be done *per se*, and nothing *per alium*, or from an admiration of the sum total of such engagements, as depicted upon paper, if he be given to statistics; more frequently are they multiplied, especially in rural parishes, from lack of co-operation in the laity. The Church has to put up with a number of cyphers, which, in the Sects, would either be reckoned for units, or put out. The parish pastor acts most unwisely who does not embrace the offer of his people to take off his hands as much of that work as possible which does not pertain to his spiritual office.

But while we thank our friend for commiserating the clergy

on account of the number of their distracting engagements, whereby their preaching becomes deteriorated, especially, no doubt, in the judgment of such as have neither time nor inclination to relieve them of such pressure, though others, who have the inclination, find the time, there are certain of the clergy still more deserving of universal commiseration—I mean those of them who are guilty, and "verily guilty" they are, of merging every function of the priest in the work of the preacher. "Of all men," the majority of these, sooner or later, become "the most miserable." With no other weapon to fight with against "sin, the world, and the devil," but "the talk of the lips," which, if it be alone, as Solomon saith, though not, perhaps, as to its pecuniary, but certainly as to its moral results, "tendeth only to penury," in the issue they are all but sure to confess to defeat. A "charitable work" would it be on the part of our spiritual fathers to warn every young man to whom, in the freshness of his zeal at his Ordination, they "commit, by the imposition of their hands, the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," against setting out upon his mission with the delusion of becoming a fine preacher, and losing sight of all the more valuable prerogatives of the Priesthood in that. Such a course is certain to end in after years in bitter disappointment. While the mere preacher, that "fond thing vainly invented," will cease to be worshipped by his admirers, when his images no longer attract them, and the relics of his genius no longer command their esteem, the faithful priest, in the relations he bears to human souls, will preserve his influence for good to the last; and the simple and earnest words he has spoken in Christ's Name will have an abiding place in the memories of his flock long after the oratorical periods of his neighbour are forgotten. And let no one say who is in danger of splitting upon this "stone of stumbling and rock of offence," that he is without examples to deter him from so doing. Cautions come from all sides, not from those who run down preaching because they cannot preach, but from those run down *by* preaching who *can*. No one who is tempted on this wise need purchase his experience for himself: plenty there are who will readily make him a present of it: *Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum.* None can have occasion to sacrifice their Priesthood to their Preachership; for the priest, who is also a preacher, finds too many of his people who prefer him much more in the latter character than the former. How sad a wail is that uttered by the late F. W. Robertson, to whose memory, rare and gifted preacher that he was, it would be unjust to

affirm that he sacrificed every thing to preaching:—"Sermons," he says, "are crutches—*I believe often the worst things for spiritual health that ever were invented.*" Again, he says:—"Sermons enfeeble the strong." Speaking of what are called "impressive" discourses, he says:—"I see what rhetoric does, and what it seems to do, and I thoroughly despise it. I think it makes people worse instead of better; exposes the feelings to tension, like the falling constantly of a spring backward, until the spring loses its elasticity, becomes weak, or breaks; and yet, perhaps, I do it injustice." If this apply to the ministry of others, referring to his own he says:—"I cannot even rejoice without fear; for I confess that at best pulpit instruction seems to me to be as pernicious as it is efficacious. To spend life, and waste all strength of nerve and heart upon it, seems like a duty of sowing the sea-sand. Some good is done, but much less than people think." Once more, he says:—"How long will sermonising continue? With all my heart, I hope not to the end of life, unless life be nearly done; for it is a kind of mean martyrdom by a lingering death." Yes; and he might have added, that those who are mean enough to inflict the martyrdom are the "dear hearers," or, as some preachers prefer to call them, their "respected audience."

The treatment which many a man has received from his congregation, after having afforded them the best efforts of his mind, and the most touching effusions of his heart for many a year, has been, to use language not at all too severe, inexpressibly cruel. Too often do the clergy get reminded that they are "men of like passions" with others, when it would be far better if their reminders did not so often forget the fact themselves. In remembrance of the neglect and indifference he has had to endure from some who have had the benefit of his most assiduous labours and his most fervent prayers, counterbalanced, it is true, by the affectionate obedience and careful kindness of others, many a minister of CHRIST has wished he had no feelings at all. What hardness of heart has he not met with from those whose tears as he preached were always close to the eye! All honour to Mr. Robertson for speaking so plainly; and he always was plain, even to a fault. How dissatisfied soever our critics may be with the effects of sermons, the preachers of sermons, who are in earnest in preaching them, are more so. Fully am I, for one, persuaded of the hardening effects of what people speak of as a "stated ministry." There was an odd phrase in use among old divines, in which they embodied these effects, viz., "Gospel-hardened." If any objection was offered to the phrase,

as if it were so shocking to think that the Gospel *should* harden, they had their illustration ready in this, that "the same sun which melts one object, hardens another." And so it is. Sermon hearers there are, who, after they have lived beyond a certain time in disobedience to the truths which they have been repeatedly taught, can resist any amount of solemn entreaty, and continue to disobey, while they may also continue to praise the "beautiful" sermons by which they are exhorted to obedience. Hence it is that there are few who labour in word and doctrine, who do not, as they grow older, become increasingly suspicious of the advantage of preaching chiefly, still more, exclusively, to the feelings; having witnessed so much avoidance of plain Christian duties, an evasion of the sterner requisitions of the Gospel of CHRIST, on the side of those whose feelings, under their ministry, were apparently the most deeply affected. Sermons which make persons feel inclined to weep are not always the sermons calculated to make them give alms, or to give up luxuries. "Impressive" sermons (as if the business of the ambassador of the SON of GOD were simply to make an impression) have done far more than many are aware to steel the heart against the practical self-denial of "the law of the Spirit of Life." They have brought multitudes to rest in the impression, knowing it might be renewed, while they have rested content in the omission of deeds that should never have been deferred. Preachers, alas! though they be not, are commonly enough treated as performers. So long as congregations are satisfied with their performance (and preachers are not always aware how much that depends upon their being satisfied with themselves), they are mutually pleased; but it is astonishing how soon congregations think they discover that the performance is not so good as it formerly was, though by reason of age, or greater wisdom, or greater reticence in the preacher's utterances, who, though less voluble, may be more edifying, it may be much better; and so, after grumbling a while about the "falling off," they go after some other performer. My predecessor in the Rectory of S. Mary-le-Strand, who began life as a very popular preacher, but who was afterwards led to take a more solemn view of his responsibilities, was wont to declare that "so soon as he became worthy of being heard, numbers of people ceased to hear him." They averred that he "no longer preached the Gospel," from the moment, when, according to his own honest persuasion, he began truly to preach it.

The popular preacher cannot for a length of time escape the

conviction that a large proportion of the gadders after sermons attend the House of God, only out of compliment to *themselves*, to their own understandings, or powers of discernment. To assume that every member of a congregation is drawn together out of regard either to Preacher or Priest, the Church, or the Service, must be as absurd as to suppose that a young lady, in surveying her countenance in a mirror, does so out of respect to the glass; and S. James tells us, that all "hearers of the Word that are not doers," are like unto one who "beholds his natural face in a glass, beholding himself, and going his way, and straightway forgetting what manner of man he was;" and if "forgetting what manner of man he was," certainly forgetting the sermon, in which, as in a mirror, he saw himself—the more forgetful the more faithful the reflection. In the matter of sermons, there are masses of hearers who attend upon the ministrations of a particular preacher, thinking not so much of *his* reputation, as of their own. Almost every man, if you take his word for it, is a judge of what constitutes a good sermon. "I think *I* ought to know what a good sermon is," is an utterance which may often be heard among the crowd. It means that he has a certain opinion of himself, of his own critical faculty, which he brings to bear upon the man whom he permits to talk to him on the Sunday, which he cannot afford to compromise by listening to one of whom a wide constituency has not a good opinion. He has a certain character to sustain among his neighbours as a sermon hearer; and in order to sustain this, he must see to it that the orator to whom he awards his patronage is worthy of it. He can no more put up with what he considers an indifferent homily (not that he is an infallible authority in the matter, but that he thinks himself, and wishes others to think so), than he can put up with indifferent wine, being an excellent judge of that, too; and if, according to his estimation, there should be any falling off in the Homiletic article with which he wishes to be supplied on the first day of the week, he will not have much scruple in treating the unfortunate genius whose business it is to supply it, as he treats any other purveyor in whose articles there may have been a falling off; i. e., in leaving him, and resorting to another. And it is surprising how trivial an excuse frequently will suffice with such patrons to justify their leaving—an excuse which, perhaps, would not suffice to justify their leaving the wine-merchant who had sent them some bad port, or the tradesman who had forwarded them some tough poultry. Their only reason for leaving may be that they have heard one man long enough, as they apprehend; that they have obtained the key to the general structure of his mind,

are pretty well acquainted with all that he has to offer them, and advise themselves, as folks say when they go out of town, that they "want a change." They may leave even because the preacher is growing old, and they think they would like to "sit under" a younger man. And among such hearers, whose "tender mercies are cruel," it is not deemed extraordinary if they say, "We don't hear Mr. So-and-So now," without assigning any reason for their desertion whatever. Scarcely a popular preacher has there ever been that has not outlived his popularity; though, as years increased, deserving, not to be less, but, in a better sense, to be more popular. Many a preacher is there still living in town and country, who once attracted applauding crowds, whom few now hear of, and fewer care to hear, whose former admirers are uncertain whether he be alive or dead. It is not that he is no longer entitled to attention, but that he has long since gone out of fashion. Popularity, like riches, too soon "maketh itself wings, and flieth away." No messenger of Heaven need ever seek *it;* in the measure that is good for him, let it, if it will, seek *him.*

Can it be said that, hitherto, extemporaneous preaching, as it is called, has flourished in the Church of England? The writer is afraid that with truth this cannot be said; that here we do not shine. With few exceptions, extempore address among the clergy, as, indeed, among Englishmen generally, cannot but be pronounced a failure. If preaching be in such a state as it is represented to be, which we do not admit, it would be a pity that it should be further deteriorated by the general disuse of the written discourse; neither is it at all likely that the clergy, as a body, will soon have the courage to abandon it. Every one, indeed, who has to speak to men for GOD, ought to be able to speak without written words; but all are not able to do it: and till they become so it had better not be attempted. Much may be advanced in favour of such preaching; and of all innovations on our present mode, that, probably, would be the most acceptable, though not, I opine, among those whose judgment is best entitled to acceptance. Among uneducated folk, the man who preaches, as they say, "without book," is sure to be popular, setting aside the question of what he says. He is thought to be more clever than his brethren because he does so. Among the educated the same verdict may not be awarded. And if the preacher, among his own flock, which may consist of the humbler sort, may be successful by adopting this style of address, it does not follow that if he adopt the same, several of his brethren being present at his prelection, they should be of the same mind as to the gift

bestowed upon him. During a season of Ritual reaction, too, when preaching is put not only on its proper level, but, perhaps, a little below it, extemporaneous speaking, with inferior matter spoken, may pass muster for a while, though it may not be accepted with the same indiscriminateness when preaching returns to its just mean. If Churchmen generally should adopt the extempore sermon, unless it manifest more carefulness in its preparation than it has hitherto done, or unless those only be allowed to undertake it who have the gift, instead of helping them to win their cause, it may endanger their losing it, especially with some whom it is most desirous that they should win; seeing the practice may be attributed to a revived antipathy to preaching.

It is somewhat singular that among the clergy there should be this inclination towards extempore preaching, while among educated Nonconformists there should be a returning to manuscript; and, that while among us there should be advocates even for extempore supplications, among them there should be a desire for the restoration of forms of prayer. It would be disastrous for us if extemporaneous preaching should be adopted under a mistaken apprehension, and so adopted that it should become unpremeditated. It is just possible, though not after a little reflection, that it should be adopted from the notion that it demands less labour and will require less pains. Never was there a more serious mistake, unless such preaching is to become thoroughly weak and ineffective. To be really operative and influential, such preaching will necessitate more care and greater preparation. Want of preparation may be concealed, it is true, by fluency of speech; but such fluency of speech may be associated with paucity of ideas—what ideas there are, flowing freely from the mind when it is not particularly full,—as a certain Dean of S. Patrick's, if I remember rightly, has shown,—just as a congregation departs from a church the faster when it is comparatively empty; but it is truly lamentable, if the want of preparation is *not* to be concealed. *Ars est celare artem;* but what if there be no art to be concealed, and no art to conceal it? On the other hand, the cost of preparation may be hidden from the thoughtless in the apparent unpreparedness of the speech. The author of *Lacon, or Many Things in Few Words*, which, but for the remonstrances of his friends, he had decided, as he said, upon dedicating to fewer people, those who think, but having been persuaded to omit the words "fewer people," and so to leave all his readers to conjecture that they were thinkers, remarks:—"Extemporaneous and oral harangues will always have this

advantage over those that are read from a manuscript; every burst of eloquence or spark of genius they may contain, however studied they may have been beforehand, will appear to the audience to be the effect of the sudden inspiration of talent; whereas similar efforts, when written, although they might not cost the writer half the time in his closet, will never be appreciated as any thing more than the slow efforts of long study and laborious application." As was already admitted, to deliver himself habitually without writing, conveys, without question, to a large class of listeners the idea of cleverness in the preacher; but, let it be repeated, it is chiefly to that class whose opinions as to a preacher's cleverness, or want of cleverness, are the least trustworthy; who base their opinions upon some accidental circumstance which would have little or no weight with those whose judgment would be entitled to deference, and to whose opinions it would be detrimental to his usefulness for the preacher, especially if he be a young man, to defer. The class we have in view is made up largely of that "undiscerning public" with whom a good face or a good figure in the preacher avails much, though his discourse might exhibit but the sorriest figure, and be one upon which it would be impossible to put a good face, or who lay much stress on the preacher's "pleasant voice;" to whom, indeed, he is as "a lovely song, and one that can play well upon an instrument," but with whom the character of the music, whether it be in tune or out of tune, whether an Advent Sermon be transferred to Lent, or a Lenten one to Advent, or whether it be tuned to orthodoxy or tuned to heterodoxy, are minor considerations. These be they who would never have "taken sittings," even under that Apostle whose "bodily presence" they said "was weak, and his speech contemptible," had there been another preacher at hand to gratify their "itching ears." And these, too, be they with whom the rambling, inconsecutive, extemporaneous effusion is all but sure to be in favour; and for any one recently ordained to "the office and work of a Priest," to give in to their likings, or to permit himself to be taken with their flatteries, would be one of the worst fatalities that could befall him.

S. Alphonsus Liguori, in his *Instructions to Preachers*, writes thus:—"Let young preachers take care to develope and to commit to memory their sermons before they deliver them from the pulpit. To preach extempore is useful, inasmuch as the discourse becomes thus more natural and familiar; this, however, is not the case with young men, but only with those who have been in the habit of preaching for many years: otherwise young men would

contract a habit of speaking without preparation, and of preaching at random, saying whatever occurred to them, without any order or arrangement." And almost any one might safely predict, that a young man, who, from the day of his ordination, should commence with unwritten discourses, or dispense altogether with writing, must speedily run his resources dry. With those who are older, who have been writers as well as deliverers of sermons, it is different. They find that the habit of writing in course of time relieves its necessity. As their thoughts become matured, they become liable to repetition from their lips, which makes much of their past labour in booking them superfluous. But such repetition of their thoughts is due, not to the drying up of their resources, but rather to the consistency and the urgency of their testimony. "As we said before, so say I now again," is the formulary that covers the ground. It is nothing to the purpose for a young preacher to say—"I have no time to write sermons, such is the amount of other work I have to do." If a man have to preach, he must find time, or if he have not the time, in consequence of the amount of other work devolving upon him (and this can readily be believed), does it follow that he should be required to preach? Is not the remedy still the same—fewer sermons, which would not oblige every priest to be a preacher? And if a man have not time to write sermons, how will he have time for "the reading," to which the critic refers, "necessary to produce them?" Yet time ought to be found for reading as well as for writing, or writing without reading will be a waste of time; and the chief difference between one who writes sermons without reading, and one who delivers sermons without reading or writing, is, that while the former will waste his own time, the latter will waste his neighbour's time also, if indeed both of them be not chargeable with the same fault. "Will you be diligent in prayer, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?" is one of the momentous Ordination questions. But if the clergy generally have little time for writing, learned leisure in Cathedral closes being bestowed so copiously on such as cannot handle the pen, have they not even less time for reading? And is there not a danger, that during what little time they have, instead of "laying aside the study of the world and the flesh," they should resort to it, in some form or other of the world's light literature, as a relaxation from the burden of parochial care?

If the lamentation of Simon Grynæus were applicable three

hundred years ago, though he need not have uttered it, because people were not then prepared to appreciate Plato; and if Mr. Coleridge deemed it more applicable to this country since the Revolution of 1688, it is to be feared it is far more applicable to all classes among us now:—"Ac dolet mihi quidem deliciis literarum inescatos subito jam homines adeo esse, præsertim qui Christianos se profitentur, ut legere nisi quod ad præsentem gustum facit, sustineant nihil: unde et disciplinæ et philosophia ipsa jam fere prorsus etiam a doctis negliguntur"—words of wisdom, which Coleridge has thus happily done into English:—"In very truth it grieveth me that men, those especially who profess themselves to be Christians, should be so taken with the sweet baits of literature, that they can endure to read nothing but what gives them immediate gratification. Consequently, the more austere and disciplinary branches of philosophy itself are almost wholly neglected even by the learned." Men who have to preach must read, if they would sustain the interest of their fellow-creatures in their message; not the books which every one reads, and which are every where talked over, but the books which every one will not care to read, and which are generally not heard of. The most original of preachers have usually been students of the oddest of volumes. There is a world of reading helpful to the "knowledge of the Holy Scriptures" to be met with in the by-paths trodden by saints and thinkers, which they altogether miss who never leave the highway. The messenger of GOD to men, would he be "throughly furnished" for that department of his work which has to do with oral ministration in public, and guard against its being taken out of his hands by philosophical romance writers and metaphysical novelists, who are being elevated by their idolaters into the position of prophets and teachers of this generation, ought to be always on the alert for Homiletic topics—continually jotting down, as they occur, thoughts, sayings, reflections, axioms for future adoption—observations upon things and events, men and manners—hints gathered from conversations, and friendly discussions with those whose mission in the world, if not one with, lies parallel to, his own—unprofessional remarks on the details of ministerial duty—senses of Scripture which come to the mind in hearing Scripture read, in meditation, in prayer, in the perusal of devotional works, in the study of the Bible at times as if *it* had never had a commentator, nor *he* a prepossession, or which drop gently into the soul from the "Fountain of all Wisdom," through his habitual converse with GOD—and with this alertness to seize hold of all that is helpful in the present, there should be

the endeavour to realise the features of society, amidst which men, from the Fathers of the Church downward, and all who have lived during revolutionary crises and periods of transition, have laboured in the past, if his sermons are to bear a sympathetic and beneficial relation to the life and labours, the sorrows and temptations, of the struggling multitude around him. A preacher thus equipped will find the task of preparation for the Pulpit wonderfully lightened, and will have, both his mind, and the book he keeps for the purpose, stored with germs of discourse, requiring comparatively little development to fit them for the "ministration of grace to the hearer." At any rate, let the delusion be for ever dispelled, that extemporaneous preaching, would the preacher be like an householder which "bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old"—many things being new mainly because they have been forgotten—would he be endued with ability to set old truths in such new lights, that one theological will-with-a-wisp of the age and another shall cower before their effulgence—is an easier road to his object than any other method. It will demand greater thought, labour, study, and prayer. An order of preachers we might not require to deliver ably written discourses, but an order we should require for the production of extemporaneous ones, unless we be content that preaching should become feeble and flimsy. Meanwhile, why should not the writers of sermons so far make their manuscripts their own as to deliver them as though they were unwritten, or as if the manuscript had been left at home; and thus combine the advantage of both uses? Is a man really the master of his own thoughts, or has he any thoughts to be master of, if he cannot do this? Why are sermons, composed the week before they are preached, to be delivered, as they too often are, as if the preachers had not seen them for a year? Nay, why are sermons delivered continually, as if some one else had composed them whose writing is difficult to read, not the preacher's self? Is there no medium between delivering to the people what has not been committed, and would not have been worth committing to a manuscript, and, instead of delivering to the people what has been committed to a manuscript, delivering it rather to the manuscript to which it has been committed?

Our critic, with whose ideas on the preacher we have been occupied, asks, as he judges, triumphantly, whether any hearer of 104 sermons annually could be found who had "carried away from them 104 distinct and definite ideas?" He requests that the name and address of the person might be left at the publish-

ing office, apparently under the conviction that it would be as difficult to produce such a being as to convey thither a mermaid or a megatherium? But the chief reason why people carry so little away with them from sermons, is, I submit, that too much is given them; too many sermons, and too much matter, be the matter what it will, in each sermon. We want shorter sermons; but how are they to be had? The art of condensation is a comparatively rare gift; few speakers have it, and few writers. Editors are quite as unnecessarily lengthy as preachers. To say all that a man ought to say on a given topic, and to omit every thing he ought not to say, is less easily done in fifteen minutes than in half an hour, if even he gained the credit with the lovers of length for having done it. To preach a short sermon out of a full heart, which shall not be an unfinished one, is by no means so easy as to preach a sermon of the average continuance out of habit. The last surviving Apostle, in his old age, was wont to deliver a sermon of five words. As his years increase, and so many of his words seem to have "fallen to the ground," where is the pastor who is not willing to *say* less, if he could but bring his flock to *think* more? But though it be not given to men who are not Apostles to say much in five words, would it not be possible to say some thing in five minutes which would be like "a nail fastened in a sure place" in the heart or conscience of the hearers? Why should not a few thoughtful, well-digested remarks be given occasionally after the second lesson, lasting no longer than a few minutes, instead of the set discourse of half an hour or three quarters? Why should not the sermon in the Communion Office occasionally be equally brief? Why should not *that* last but some minutes, instead of being drawn out to a length which serves but to make the people forget that it is the Office of Communion that is going on? It cannot be indispensable that the remarks of the preacher should always be prefaced with a text. A text does not necessarily make the sermon Scriptural. Sermons the most unscriptural have been based upon passages of Scripture. The only thing which has been Scriptural about such sermons may have been the text. If a text be taken, the sermon should be its interpretation; but to take a text for the sake of custom is disrespectful to the Holy Book. The formalisms of our preaching might well be dispensed with, that its realities might remain. In the Elizabethan age people listened uncomplainingly to sermons two or three hours in length; and the demand for short sermons now may be as much of a passing whim as the endurance of long ones then: but though all have not the gift of brevity, it is not impos-

sible that those who have it might so shorten their concionations, condensing, not eliminating their worth, as to lead the worthiest members of their flocks unfeignedly to regret that they were so short; and when it comes to this, we may enter upon a new æra in the matter of preaching.

The Church of England is somewhat unfortunately situated as to sermons. Theoretically a Sacramental Church, she has practically become a preaching Church; and it is on their account, who have made her practically this preaching Church, and not on theirs who "remember and forget not" that GOD'S Sacraments cannot be separated from GOD'S Word, that a revolution is needed in the present Sermonic practice. It is not a little remarkable that since the Reformation, which is supposed to have restored preaching to the efficiency which it had lost during the unpreaching ages that preceded (though, while the number of mediæval preachers may have been fewer than in the succeeding time, some of their peculiarities were most excellent), it should have been gradually losing its effect with the lineal descendants of its restorers. The common characteristic of Protestant congregations in the present day, the more strongly marked according to the intensity of their Protestantism, is, that they will listen to nothing from their preachers which they have not previously received; and though the preacher may appeal to the Bible for the truth of what he propounds, it has little more weight with the class of mind with which he has to deal than if he relegated the hearers to the Koran. If the Protestants of three hundred years ago had been actuated by the Protestant spirit of later times, Protestantism itself would have been an impossibility. Take any average Hanoverian Church of England man, for example, with his strong prejudices, his determination to keep all things as they are, and his unreasoning and unreasonable opposition to the incumbent who innovates in any degree upon the semi-pagan usages of his parish church; who, we ask, if the same disposition had possessed his fathers which possesses him, could more effectually have resisted that change of religion, in the sixteenth century, of which he makes his boast, than they? Preaching is powerless with such a man, and its chief use with him is to keep him contented in his absence from Sacraments.

Now, the Church of which he professes himself a member, to judge by the single rubric wherein reference is made thereto, is minded but for one sermon in the day. More than one she may allow, but one only she authorises:—"Then shall follow the sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth, by authority." By the way, though authority

would not avail much with such as are authorities to themselves, how would those who are so dissatisfied with the present Homiletic provision made for them, fancy being put for a few months on the diet of the Homilies proper? But the Church of England, being minded for one sermon in the day, is surely minded also that her members generally should hear that one; and, as we have seen in the course of this conversation, one sermon in a day is enough for any body if it be really a useful one, and more than enough if it be not. Yet, while this sermon need not be at precisely the same hour in the day, discretion is not allowed to have it at any service in the day. "Then shall follow the sermon," the sermon for the day; thus indicated as perspicuously as the Epistle or Holy Gospel for the day. "*Then.*" When? At a certain place in the Eucharistic Office, after the Creed; the Creed having been developed out of the Gospel, and the sermon being the elucidation, as occasion serves, of both. The sermon is appointed in the midst of the Celebration of Holy Communion, not *after* the Communion Service, but *in* it; not *before* persons "take the Sacrament," but *during* the Sacrament. It is thus a portion of the highest act of worship in which the "Church militant here in earth" can be engaged. Can it be supposed that the Church of England, in contrast with universal Christendom, intended this highest act of worship to be used as an excuse for sermon hearing? Can she have meant that her thousands should attend upon a part of this service, and go away with the notion that the sermon completes the whole of it? Having appointed one sermon in the day, and having set it in the midst of the most solemn of her functions, can it have been her intention that her children should follow that function only so far as the sermon's conclusion? "He that can receive it, let him receive it." By placing the sermon or homily where she does, she cannot but have intended that those who hear it should remain, "as in all Churches of the Saints," to the end of the service where it is. It might be desirable, on many grounds, that on other occasions preaching should be separated from worship; but here is a case in which it is inseparable from it, if there be a sermon at all. And if the sermon be thus connected with the worship, is it reasonable for the sermon hearers to be separated from it? The service is a whole, the attendants thereat need not divide it in half. Why be present at any portion of it? Why use that portion for the sake of the sermon which can be of real benefit to them only so far as it leads them to use the rest? We have in view now only those Churches where the priest never begins the Eucharistic Office without the intention of completing it.

Only one reason is there why a priest should ever do so, which is, that he cannot secure the presence of two or three communicants; though, unless this be his own fault (and it is not easy to conceive it would not be so), even then it is hard that he himself should be deprived of Communion: but as the Prayer Book now stands it does not justify the priest's communicating alone. Will it justify two or three priests, where they are, communicating without people? The rubric touching Communion in "Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and Colleges," seems to answer—Yea. If there be no sermon during the Liturgy, it might suffice for those only to be present who intend to communicate, as at early Celebrations; but where there is a sermon, and there are few places where at a later hour there is not, the only consistent rule is, that the whole congregation should remain to the last, if they will be there from the first. As for those Churches where early Communions are adopted on the score of convenience, but where, two Sundays out of four, or three out of five, through a maimed rite, the sermon is still left to "exalt itself above all that is called GOD, or that is worshipped," at mid-day, when most people who most need to be taught better are gathered together, much cannot be said. To repeat a portion of an Office which has already been used entire, the Office as used in its entirety having, perhaps, conveyed to those present but one idea of the Eucharist, while the portion of it used conveys to them none, is, at the best, a dubious repetition. The common apology, that unless the communicants be divided the service is so long, cannot be accepted while it is usually the sermon that lengthens it. In some few instances, among those who would agree but little, it may be, with many of the sayings in this book, the practice has been adopted of intermitting the sermon altogether on "Sacrament Sundays," which they cannot do, with whom there is no Sunday that is not "Sacrament Sunday," and with the result that some of the "dear hearers" who had never communicated dropped off on the occasion, while those of them that did not, sooner or later became communicants. These, and other varieties of use that might be named (and even Nonconformists do not discourage the attendance at "the breaking of bread" of such as are not in full communion with them), are, let us believe, a feeling after a better state of things, when this Imperial "Cæsar," the sermon, shall have "rendered to it the things that are Cæsar's, and GOD, to Him the things that are GOD's."

But does not the fact that the sermon is ordered during the Eucharistic Celebration seem to indicate of what sort the sermon so ordered should be—that there should be somewhat special,

pointed, definite about it—that it should be far other than the vague, indistinct, "uncertain sound" that is usually heard—that it should deal not with any thing, but with some thing in particular—that it should seek really to fix the hearers some where—that it should be a portion of an educational series in Christian truth, not an insulated dissertation—that it should be consistent with the high Institute in which it is honoured with a position, and not be out of all analogy thereto? Does not the space here allotted to the sermon urge itself upon all preachers as a golden opportunity not to be missed? Is it not little short of a profanation to fill up these precious moments, to use the phrase "made ready to our hand," with "general reflections on religion and morality?" Yet this is what preachers have been content to do; and what has been the fruit of such idle laboriousness? Is it possible, that if the generality of discourses delivered during the Eucharistic Office, even where there are weekly Celebrations, had made but some distant approach to that which discourses delivered at such a time and in such a place should be, they could have left us surrounded with our present uncatholic, unenlightened, unworshipping, uncommunicating population? If the question were asked, Which of our addresses have been the least effective? the answer would surely be, Those which have been uttered on Sunday mornings under this awful sanction; and were the question asked, Which of them have been the most effectual? would not the answer be, Those to which utterance has been given on some week evening, when the sense of distance has been lessened between the teacher and the taught, and the preacher has spoken to the people instead of making a speech? All ministerial experience goes to prove that while the attendants on week-day services may be but few, the few who do attend exercise an appreciable influence for good on the Sunday attendants; and if the remarks made on the Sunday morning were but as direct, straightforward, perspicuous, and unadorned as those which are uttered on week evenings, or on other odd occasions, that influence would be widely extended. But under our present system, or want of system, when a sermon at one time of the day takes its chance of being delivered at any other time, when the sermon intended for the morning may be transferred to the evening, or the one intended for the evening to the morning (if, indeed, the morning be not the occasion for the preacher's self-display, and he give not a much coarser material in the evening, or remit the whole service to his assistant), what results can be expected from such a "casting down of the foundations" as this? The least that might be hoped for from the

morning sermon, were it in keeping with, or did it bear a proper relation to the service in which it is a feature, is, that it would by degrees bring the people to be tolerably well "instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven," to be conscious of their responsibilities as members of "CHRIST'S Body, the Church," to do those things which befit their being such; in short, to "walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the LORD blameless." Can it be hoped for so long as our homilies are so haphazard as they have been? Could it ever have been hoped for under the habitual *Missa sicca* of a proprietary chapel, since the evangelical fervour of such places declined? an "abomination of desolation," whose aridity was relieved only by a few forced flowers of sickly, sentimental rhetoric, presented to the admiring auditory by the morning preacher in unexceptionable kid gloves, or with an ungloved hand adorned with gold rings?

Our morning sermons on every side require a thorough reformation. They require to be pointed instead of being pointless. To this habit of vague, indefinite, unspecific sermonising, at the most valuable opportunity of the day, do we mainly owe it that such multitudes of Church people content themselves with a single attendance at Church during the day. If they came but once in the day, were it but for the right object, the "offering and presenting unto GOD the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," there would not be so much reason to complain; but they do not. Evening service being on the whole so much like the morning, and the sermons being so little different, they seem to themselves, by a single attendance, simply to avoid a repetition. From this class arises much of the opposition which is offered to the division of the services, especially to the transfer of the Litany to a later hour. As they come to Church but once, they like to have the services accumulated that are not subject to repetition. From the same cause, the sameness of all sermons, and the sameness of Morning and Evening Prayer, where Holy Communion is not brought into prominence in the morning, hundreds content themselves with a morning attendance, which, for any specific object, might as well be an evening one, while hundreds of others are quite as well satisfied with an evening attendance, not apprehending aught that is specific in a morning one. In some instances, the morning attendants have condescendingly resigned, in their absence, the use of their rented or appropriated seats to other classes of society, instead of by their own presence encouraging such to come. It is marvellous, in spiritual things, how many a remedy is devised which is little better than the disease. One of our first requisites is an endea-

vour to make the morning sermon distinctively useful to the baptised. The sermon which is honoured by a place in the Eucharistic Office ought to lead the people to honour the Eucharist. If it do not, or seek not to do this, it is labour in vain. In order to this, if the morning sermon were delivered from the Altar instead of from the pulpit—assuming there were some thing like an Altar to deliver it from, and the sermon did not discredit the Altar, neither the Altar the sermon—it might not be unavailing. A change like this would help to the identification of the sermon with the service, as it is not identified now, and would teach congregations, one might trust, that they were not mere sermon hearers, but the hearers of a sermon in the midst of a much more solemn and important engagement, which consideration would increase, not diminish, the solemnity of sermon hearing.

The most unsatisfactory attendants upon sermons, as every minister of CHRIST with any experience knows, are those who frequent the House of GOD for nothing else. They hear the worst whose religion is made to consist in hearing. Frequently is it said persons ought not to come to Church only for the sermon; on the other hand, it might be well, if they did come only for the sermon, if there were only the sermon to come for, as in the occasional separation of preaching from worship would be the case. Such comers to Church would thus declare themselves, and the sermon, separated from the worship, might deal with them accordingly, and beget in them a healthier condition of mind. The expression most frequently on the lips of such as absent themselves from the House of GOD when there is no preaching, is, "only prayers." Who can tell, if they could be induced to resort to GOD's House, though at first to their own confusion, when there would be nothing but preaching, they might not come to adopt the expression, *only a sermon*, and so be led to value the prayers as they had never valued them before? The experiment of separating prayers and preaching would at least be worthy of a trial. The religious community delighting to call itself the "Catholic Apostolic Church" has adopted this separation, as it would seem with good success, if the test of such success be the intelligent reception of its tenets on the part of its adherents. Why should it not be successful if adopted by ourselves? Why are the clergy of the Church of England, except in the case of such as apply to them for "ghostly counsel and advice" to be the only body of religious teachers in the kingdom who remain from year to year in the dark as to the effect of their instructions on the majority of those who listen to

their lessons. There is in every community but our own some means of forming an estimate. Yet a faithful witness for GOD among us may be ignorant to the end of his days, unless he question his parishioners as to their spiritual estate, in a manner to which he seems not born, whether a word he has uttered has touched the souls of many whose bodily presence he seldom missed from the scene of his ministrations. It is not too much to say, that with the multitude who claim to represent the Church of England, not as *she* ought, but as *they* would wish her to be, the parish priest is a being not to be consulted, except on "things pertaining to this life," but to be avoided.

The considerations which the writer has thus far adverted to suggest another momentous inquiry, which is this, whether, as preachers or hearers, we have yet arrived at any distinct understanding as to the objects to be attained by preaching? We preach for the sake of preaching; it is a custom to be kept up. We hear for the sake of hearing; that, too, is a custom to be kept up. Preaching and hearing are made their own ends instead of being treated as means to other ends. What notion of the object of preaching can any one have, or can he have a notion that there is any object in it whatever, save the filling up of a vacant half-hour, who, like one of the magazine critics with whose castigation of sermons we have been engaged, tells us, in relation to the topics with which the preacher has to deal, that they are "subjects which nothing but genius can handle in such a manner as to command attention"? One is tempted to exclaim, in meeting with language such as this—"O GOD! are not the disclosures of Thy Word respecting what Thy blessed Saints were wont to describe as the four last things, Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell, sufficient to 'command the attention' of Thy sinful creatures, whose brief journey of life will so soon bring them face to face with these realities, unless they be decked out with those gaudy attractions of human genius, which those same blessed Saints would have denounced, if brought into connexion with such themes, as the devices of an actor or the trickeries of a harlot?" Surely, language of this description betrays the most lamentable misconception, or want of all conception, of the purposes of that ministry, which is set "for the perfecting of the Saints, and for the edifying of the Body of CHRIST." Yet I am by no means clear that people generally have a higher conception of them. It is this low estimate of so great a work, with which not Angels but men have been entrusted, which begets the number of useless, aimless sermons

which pastors preach and people hear; sermons filling up no conceivable void, and which are directed to no possible end. They begin with and end in themselves.

But a large proportion of what goes by the name of "the religious world" is more in love with this purposeless preaching than with any other style. The sermons most suited to their taste are not those which are addressed *to* them, but those which partake rather of the character of a speech made *before* them, or an oration uttered in their presence, which they can criticise and pass judgment upon at their leisure. They like to stand aloof from the sermon as they would from some work of art, of whose merits the spectator cannot form an opinion if he be not at a proper distance from it. If such hearers be preached *to*, they imagine themselves to be preached *at*, and they resent the affront accordingly. We read of sermons being preached *before* right reverend bishops, honourable governors of charitable institutions, right honourable lord mayors, aldermen, sheriffs, common councilmen, and the like; and whether or not the class of hearers now indicated fancy themselves transformed for the occasion into one or other of these illustrious personages, it is certain that they hear sermons with greater pleasure if they can hear them at a short remove from themselves, if they can divest them of individual relation, and treat the preacher's address as an oratorical procession passing before them, and awaiting their decision as to its merits. No wonder the late Mr. Robertson should have spoken as he did touching rhetoric, declaring that it "made people worse instead of better." "Nothing," said he, "*demoralises* in the military sense, so much as the excitement arising from it. It destroys the tone of the heart, leaves an exhaustion which craves stimulus, and utterly unfits for duty." Reference has been made to the vague, pointless, indefinite character of much of our preaching; but the clergy are not wholly to blame for this. God's "people love to have it so." No specific intention is associated in their minds with the exercise. Of what use is it to offer thoughtful sermons, if people would rather avoid the trouble of thinking? The pointlessness of sermons may not always reside in the sermon itself, it may arise from the fact that people have no desire to be brought to any point. Let a congregation accustomed to a vague, indefinite style of preaching, through a change of ministry be addressed by one whose object plainly is to give the people something specifically to believe and to do, and the probability is, that for a time such a congregation will be in a state of revolt. They were satisfied with the hebdomadal excitation, so long as it did not come home to

them, but they are not at all pleased with a pastor who closes with them, and enters into their very souls. For the time he will seem to them to be so plain as to be disagreeable, and so practical as to appear to be personal; as if any preaching that is not plain could be agreeable to GOD, or any that is not personal could have any practical effect with men. By and by, when people throw off their religious artificiality they begin to love plain speaking; above all, in Church. When they begin to hear, not as they who have to criticise, but as those that "must give account," they have been heard to declare that their neighbours must have been telling their pastor all about them, so accurately, out of his own soul, has he described the condition of theirs.

We are thus thrown back upon the inquiry, What are the objects of preaching, and is the Church steadfastly setting these objects before her? The term preaching, it must be seen, has been made use of hitherto throughout this Essay in a general sense, as inclusive of every description of oral instruction and exhortation; but to leave it to such a use would be a very culpable vagueness. Under preaching must be recognized, at least these two divisions of the work—preaching as distinguished from teaching, and teaching as distinguished from preaching. The recognition of this division, and the taking of action upon it, would institute an extensive sifting both of sermons and of sermon hearers; would all but necessitate a separation of general sermon-hearing from worship; and bring to light, not invidiously, but beneficially, a distinction in hearers at present altogether overlooked. It must be evident, that preaching and teaching are not equally adapted to every class of hearers, though with our imperfect arrangements they may be equally offered to all, and may, as they do, fail of effect from the want of discrimination. The effect will fail if teaching be offered to those who stand in need of preaching, or if preaching be offered to those who crave for teaching. The two terms, "teaching and preaching" are so used in the New Testament as to evince that they are not synonymous. Preaching is the instrument of conversion; teaching of edification. Teaching is for the Church, for those "made disciples;" preaching is for the World, and by the word World, the writer would not convey any professional or intangible idea. By the World he means those whose Baptism having been neglected by others, is still neglected by themselves—the baptised who have not been brought to Confirmation, the confirmed who have not come to Holy Communion, or who having come for a few times have given it up; and the multitude who, having enjoyed all Christian

privileges, have fallen away from all, subject to besetting sins, vainly endeavouring to direct themselves, and to whom the thought never occurs to come for Confession "to some Minister of GOD'S Word, and open their grief." Though bearing the Christian name, many of them need to be brought under the preacher's voice all but as much as if they lived in a heathen land.

I have already indicated what, as I humbly conceive, should be the object of preaching during the Eucharistic Celebration; that it should aim at least at making those habitually present thereat, loyal, obedient, intelligent members of CHRIST'S Church, which their detention "with general reflections on religion and morality" is not calculated to do. But if this be not the very highest object to be proposed by preaching, it is one far higher than can at first be entertained as to the class just referred to. With respect to the work of teaching, however, as distinguished from preaching, specially preaching directed to arouse the careless, or to awaken the attention of the thoughtless, it is manifest that it may take a higher or a lower grade, that it may be simple and elementary or more advanced and profound; for such things there are as "the deep things of GOD." No lack of congregations is there among us which in no proper sense of the word can have been said to be taught. They have been preached to, or declaimed before, allured, or threatened, talked to as pagans, though baptised, or persuaded that they were model Christians, though slighting Christian privileges and neglecting Christian duties—but not *taught*. The late Archbishop Whately, I believe, he was, who, in a clerical assembly, is reported to have said, that, "For his part he did not want his clergy to *preach* the Gospel, he wanted them to *teach* it." When a teacher comes into the midst of such congregations, his first business, perhaps, he discovers to be, to create if possible an appetite for being taught. Nor is this business an easy one. Let a stranger, lately introduced into a parish, begin by setting before a congregation direct instruction, which had been used to pulpit declamation, and it is not probable he will sail immediately on a full tide of popularity. Or, which is more to the purpose as an illustration, let the minister of a parish who may hitherto have contented himself with *preaching* to the people, disappointed, as he surely will be, with the result of his labours, set himself resolutely to *teach* them—let him plainly set before them the Divine intention of the Church, and the obligations of her members—let him bring out before them the common sense of *the Book of Common Prayer*, and the violations of that common sense so extensively tolerated; let him make less of himself than he was wont to do, and more

of his message, and less of his message or of himself than of his Master and LORD—and then for the first time since his connexion with his flock, it is all but inevitable that he will be visited with black looks and unequivocal symptoms of congregational dissatisfaction, if he be not waited upon during the following week by a deputation of the churchwardens and some of the principal inhabitants, aroused for the first time from their indifference—an indifference which may nearly have broken his heart—since *their* connexion with *him*, bearing a remonstrance. And if to this teaching through the ear he should venture to add a little instruction by means of the eye, who can foretell the consequences? This may be safely foretold, taking the Church and the World as we find them, that the teacher who believes that GOD intended man to be taught by the eye, and directs a part of his teaching accordingly, will greatly save his neighbours' ears, and his own tongue. A lesson which the Christian teacher may have repeatedly conveyed without effect to his people's ears may be seen in a moment by them if placed before their eyes. Have to do with a Hanoverian congregation, would you discover how much more there is in the saying than you supposed—*Nihil esse in intellectu quod non prius per sensum.*

It becomes, then, a question with him who desires not only to preach but to teach "the things concerning the Kingdom of GOD," how much or how little he should take it for granted that folks know. As a rule, the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church appear, in their instructions, to take nothing for granted. They treat all, gentle and simple, alike, who have need of teaching. May not the clergy of the Church of England have taken too much for granted; for do they not find persons who have been hearing sermons all their life, who, "when for the time they ought to be teachers, have need that one teach them again which be the first principles of the oracles of GOD"? Two opposite pieces of advice are tendered to the clergy by opposite counsellors: the one, Take much for granted with people—they will feel themselves honoured, and be willing to receive the more; the other, Take little for granted, lest you should be mistaken, and after long labour have to begin again. If to follow the latter be grievous, it is also safe, which cannot be said of the former. It is terribly mortifying to a teacher, after having taken it for granted that folks knew certain things, to discover at length that they know nothing about them, take offence not at *their* ignorance, but at *his* mention of them, walk off, and never hear him again. But passing from the class who require to be taught "in the way of righteousness" from the beginning, we are

brought to face another class—a class with whom the writer cannot but deeply sympathise—the class which is capable of receiving much higher and wider teaching, but which, owing to the prevalence, and the spiritual necessities of the former class, were there an adequate supply of instructors to impart it, are deprived thereof. Many whom the Church gains, she loses, in consequence of such deprivation, who become merged in separate bodies, or remain Christians unattached.

The question then recurs, What are the objects of Preaching? One of its objects has been indicated in the sermon which is ordered in the chief Office of the Church. Is there another object? Is it an object of preaching, or rather of teaching by "the lips of the priest, which should keep knowledge, that the people may seek the law at his mouth," to bring Christians who are capable of it to become acquainted with the general contents of Holy Scripture? If so, and I put the question diffidently, no such object is at present attained. Large territories of Biblical Revelation are unexplored; paths of research that lead to important terminations are untrodden. It may be said, that such is the imminent peril of souls, that those set to "watch for them, as they that must give account to Him Who is ready to judge the quick and the dead," cannot afford to divert men's attention even to subjects of Divine interest, at the risk of dealing slackly with their rescue. Be it so. There is danger lest the work of the Church should partake of the haste of the age, and with its haste of its incompleteness. Edification is a duty, quite as much as conversion—to build up, as to gather in. While the work of conversion must not be sacrificed to that of edification, neither must the work of edification be sacrificed to that of conversion. How to keep those whom we convert, how to perfect those with whom we begin—these are the problems which press for solution. Or it may be said, We preach the Catholic faith, and that is sufficient. Yes; but the Catholic faith preached consists of what is necessary to be believed to salvation, and though this be an ocean of truth compared with sectarian partialities and schemes of "private interpretation," there is an expanse of Revelation beyond, which, though not necessary to salvation, it is very desirable should be sounded by such as have "believed to the saving of the soul." But this expanse is not sounded; its surface is not disturbed. These outlying districts of the Kingdom of God, which would so well repay a visit, are seldom, if ever, traversed, except by such as know not the way, or who bring back a wrong report of the land. Though

the subjects of investigation which the writer has in view may all of them be treated "according to the proportion of faith," men are liable to be condemned as heretics if they interfere with them; the consequence of which is, that their investigation is too often found conjoined with heresy of some sort or other. For there is, as it has been remarked, scarcely a sect which does not retain its hold upon its adherents, by bringing into prominence some truth, not "necessary to salvation," albeit "profitable for instruction," which the Church for the time has let slip. "These things ought not so to be." Being so, the Church is the sufferer, for she thus loses her hold of some of the best spirits of the time. She arouses consciences, and then fails to guide them; she leads men into her paths, and then neglects to "direct their goings in the way." She lays the foundation, but proceeds not with the structure; she teaches, but she perfects not the taught. Why should these things be? Why should the school of CHRIST be the only school without its advanced class? Why are those to whom it might be said, "go up higher," to be kept down, because those on a lower level of instruction will not advance? Our deficiency in not teaching those who need higher teaching, and in confining those to the rudiments of knowledge who have gone beyond them, because others remain there, is confessed by the establishment of Bible Classes, and the like machinery, whereby such as can investigate the unfrequented tracts of Holy Writ with competent companions and qualified guides, are enabled to do so. But we want not the necessity of other methods of instruction to supplement the ordinary lessons of the Pulpit, to be acknowledged outside the Church, so much as within it. The trite complaint against the Evangelical section, as it was called, or as it called itself, was, that it contracted the whole Gospel to two or three points. Though the like charge does not apply to Catholic Churchmen, even their sphere of truth, in consequence of the slowness of learners and the impoverished condition of souls, has suffered contraction. "If the trumpet" have "given" no "uncertain sound," the notes that have been sounded have been too few.

On a review of this Homiletic controversy, does not the conclusion force itself upon us, that before we shall have, or want, better preachers, we must have a large increase of better hearers; and that, pending this increase, the ordinary run of sermons is good enough? Let it be granted, that preachers do their work badly, editors, when they intrude upon the peculiar province of the preacher, certainly do it much worse. And considering the

amount of periodical trash, positively injurious, issued from the Press, which is devoured by the populace, the oracles of the Press can afford to regard with leniency the platitudes of the pulpit, which, according to their own admission, if they do no good, do no harm. It may be all very well for a select coterie, here and there, with a high opinion of their intellectuality (and from such a quarter the growl usually comes), to decry sermons in general; but there is this immediate rejoinder, that the message of the Church is not to that coterie alone, but to "all sorts and conditions of men." The Church comes into relation with all classes of society, and how to render her message acceptable to one class without making it distasteful to another, and how to secure one class without losing hold of another—how to lay hold of *men* without losing hold of *women*, and how to keep hold of women without losing hold of men—how to interest the ignorant without disgusting the learned, and how to attract the learned without repulsing the ignorant, are some of the by no means slight difficulties with which she has to contend.

Amidst all these perplexities, this, at least, is clear, whatever preachers or hearers may be, that we are far enough as yet from that period which is prophesied of, "when they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for all shall know Him, from the least to the greatest;" when bad sermons will make no one the worse, and good ones will be superfluous to make any one better. Meanwhile, it will be best to "let well alone;" and allow the work of the Pulpit, as that of other institutions, to operate, as, sooner or later, it will, its own reforms; of the need of which none can be more painfully conscious than they who are not unsuccessfully, through the blessing of GOD, engaged therein.

A. B. EVANS.

The Sacrament of Marriage.

It is a remark so common as to have become almost wearisome, that rapidity of development and progress in all departments of knowledge and in all phases of society is one of the most striking characteristics of the present age. The great wheels of human energy, never stationary even in the darkest and dreariest periods, are seen to be now revolving with accelerated speed, and to be whirling us on from change to change with a velocity which almost takes away our breath. Perhaps this may have seemed to be the case in every successive generation: our incessant complacent reference to the "nineteenth century," as though there were some preternatural illumination and exceptional infallibility of wisdom vouchsafed to it, may be only our version of the perpetual cuckoo cry—"No doubt we are the people." It is the fashion with some who predict the speedy dissolution of the world, to point out the striking applicability to our own days of the prophecy—"Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased;" and certainly it is verified now in a remarkable manner. But all these things, absolute in one light, are only relative in another: the luxuries of yesterday are the comforts of to-day, and will be the necessaries of to-morrow; and so the wisdom of one generation is the ordinary knowledge of the next, and the ignorance of the one succeeding. The world advances by geometrical progression; and, startling as each step appears when a certain point has been reached, we know that infinite knowledge yet stretches out before us, and we do not know how many links in the eternal chain we may leave behind. Still an end must come sooner or later; and as the line must be drawn somewhere unknown to us, we cannot tell how nearly we may have reached the appointed term. Students of unfulfilled prophecy may often be very silly, but the folly is not all on one side; and Dr. Cumming himself never talked greater nonsense than he who said that it is absurd to think of the world coming to an end yet awhile, for God could never allow all the stores of the great American coal-fields to be so egregiously wasted.

Difficult, however, as are the signs of the times, if we try to divine the period of the end, they are definite enough for the practical purpose of stimulating us to perpetual watchfulness of

our own position, and of the tendencies of the age towards the things clearly indicated by revelation as characteristic of "the last days," though existing as standing warnings and foreshadowings in all.

From this point of view the astonishing increase of knowledge has a deep interest altogether apart from its own subject matter and immediate results. It becomes fully as important to note its general tendency and its influence on the lives, habits, and characters of men.

And for this, too, we have not far to seek. In many ways it influences human character not for the better. Here, however, I shall refer to only two. These are increased luxuriousness and increased repugnance to control; or, in popular euphemistic phraseology, civilized refinement and liberty. "Knowledge is power:" this is the key to many actions good and bad. Many love knowledge; comparatively few for its own sake. The almost universal cry for knowledge really means, in a great measure, something very different, viz., "power;" power to indulge oneself, which is the root of luxury; power to please oneself, which is the root of insubordination.

In a remarkable manner knowledge is being made the minister of luxury; not that great portion only which relates to money-getting, but all kinds of inventive and mechanical skill are laid hold of and applied to its service; and this luxuriousness, ever growing, never satisfied, ever craving for something new, stimulates that whereby it is itself stimulated, and, on the principle of demand creating supply, sharpens the ingenuity of those whose knowledge is made to cater for the pleasures of such as can pay for it. To such a height has the spirit of worldly ease and enjoyment attained, and so far has it become the practical rule of our life and almost the end of our existence here, that it seems to be regarded as the chief object even of religion to teach us how to be most respectably and successfully worldly. The following passage from the *Saturday Review* excellently illustrates this:—"Step by step, and after various conflicts, and with many scruples, we in England have at last come to the conclusion that so long as a thing is not obviously wrong we may do it, and that we are to be largely guided in our estimate of what is or is not wrong by considerations of what will answer in this world. We have taken what we conceive to be the proper ideal of human society as the criterion of what is lawful. We have, as it were, decided to live in and for the world, and have come to look on religion as being chiefly the guide that is to teach us how to do this in a proper spirit. By a succession of compromises and

interpretations we have made the religion of the Gospel the religion of the comfortable, money-making, dinner-giving, fighting, aspiring citizen of a constitutional state. We have no doubt this is quite right, but it is obvious that much of the external distinction of the world and religion is thus done away."

I believe this witness to be, in its main features, true. The increasing elaborateness of our civilization is dragging society down to the level of a system of deliberate worldliness which is sapping the foundations of high principle and pure morality. Expediency is taking the place of right, public opinion of the law and Will of God. And as neither expediency nor public opinion have or can have any fixed standards, there is no limit to the development of those "compromises and interpretations" by which right is what we opine or find convenient, and opinions and convenience are regulated by desire. The *vox populi* of to-morrow will be no worse a guide and no less exacting a master than the *vox populi* of to-day; and the downward impetus once given will proceed in accelerated ratio whither we know not. Our enormously increased wealth and pseudo-refinement first begets, next justifies, and then advocates this state of things; and the growth of knowledge, so far as it is made subservient to it, becomes, not in itself but in its evil application, earthly and sensual.

Nor do the natural outgrowths of a morbid luxury fail to follow in due course. If we pamper our bodies they will become our masters. A man whose general rule is self-indulgence will probably be more or less inclined to profligacy. He may even persuade himself that a certain amount of it is, if not positively right, at all events not positively wrong. So of a nation. The history of the world is one long testimony to the inevitable corruption of morals by softness and luxuriousness. The abominations of Roman society in its decline, the orgies of the court of Louis XV. and Philip Egalité, are just, if extreme, examples of a world-wide truth. It is to be feared that the same spirit which gave birth to these things is, however secretly, on the increase amongst ourselves. Many are the indications that the tide of public morality is on the ebb, in spite of the outward decency which prevails, and the loud boasting of the purity of English society, "in the nineteenth century" of course. Details cannot be given: they may be found in too great abundance by those whose duty it is to seek for them. General symptoms are, however, sufficiently obvious. In morality, as in other things, we have our "succession of compromises and interpretations." The

repeated and almost successful efforts to legalize incestuous unions, on the plea among others that they are legal already in every Protestant nation of the Continent (and so much the worse for Protestantism); the torrents of pollution openly pouring in and out through the doors of the Divorce Court, at once the cause and effect of its own degradation; the shameful uncleanness of some of our recent matrimonial legislation; the scarcely veiled apology for unholy living and unholy livers put forward by leading representatives of public opinion; the low, worldly, commercial spirit in which marriages are arranged and broken off; above all, perhaps, the appalling growth of child-murder:—all these things are true warnings that all strata of our artificial state of society are infected with moral rottenness, though we may be as yet (and GOD grant it) very far from the enormities I have alluded to above. But a general sinking of the surface tells of unsoundness beneath; and, taking all things into account, I cannot hesitate to place an increasing departure from the rule of Christian purity among the noticeable features of the time, the "Questions of the day."

And still more marked, partly, no doubt, because more openly paraded, is the growth of impatience of authority. We see it in our nurseries, and trace it upwards to our grown men. The "Young England" of *Punch* was a caricature, but a caricature from the life: it exposed an evil, but could not supply the cure. The behaviour of children to their parents, servants to their masters and mistresses, pupils to their teachers, workmen to their employers, the poor to the rich, the governed to those who rule, is not, by general acknowledgment, what it used to be. On every side there is a striving after independence of that which is higher, an association of almost disgrace with the idea of inferiority and subordination, an uprising craving after self-government in things secular and sacred. Of all which increasing knowledge and precocity, the child of abnormal civilization, are most important causes. "Knowledge is power;" and power naturally rebels against restraint. It dislikes subordination to those whom it fancies to be in no way superior to itself. In proportion as mental cultivation advances, and man is made equal with man, so grows the disinclination to receive law from another, and each man desires to be a lawgiver to himself. No doubt there are legitimate aspirations in which growing intellectual capacity may indulge; but we daily see it abused to very different ends. Witness the inflammatory harangues assiduously addressed to the lower classes at so-called "Reform" meetings; under the pretext of just and reasonable

liberty, preaching up democracy, and threatening revolution and the reign of mob-law. It means, in plain terms, that might is to be the measure of right. It is the same principle in its essential features that has operated in the consolidation of the kingdoms of Italy and Prussia, in the spoliation of Denmark, in the Monroe doctrine of the United States, and in the "aspirations" and treason of the Fenian Brotherhood. It is the principle characterized in Scripture as that of "Every man doing that which is right in his own eyes," regardless of external right, and authority, and law.

But it is in sacred things that this unruly spirit is most conspicuous. "Liberty of thought," "free inquiry," *et hoc genus omne*, are its watchwords; supercilious indifference, or daring denial of doctrine; impatience of creed and dogma; scorn of scientific theology, as utterly incompatible with "modern thought;" the practical exclusion of GOD from the providential, if not also the moral, government of the world; the repudiation of the supernatural as an insult to modern science; the bold, reckless criticisms of the most sacred and venerated truths of revelation; the flaunting rejection of all the characteristics of Holy Scripture which distinguish it from any ordinary literary performance; the contemptuous negation of the spiritual character of the Church, and the derision with which the assertion of her inherent authority is received; all these are but so many manifestations of the spirit of lawlessness, which will energize with more or less violence till the coming of "the Lawless One" gathers it up for its final and most terrific outburst.

It is a subject capable of indefinite expansion. But, without going into further detail, I think it may be safely said, that the present state of society around us is strongly marked by the two principles of sensual indulgence and abhorrence of authority. Marked by these, not indeed alone, but still with sufficient prominence to make them very decidedly "Questions of the day."

As such they have many aspects and may be treated in many ways. I purpose on the present occasion to regard them in one special aspect and to treat them in one particular way. If that aspect and treatment are thought unusual and peculiar, I simply answer that I adopt them as true and important; not as, in any way whatever, exclusive of, or derogatory to, the claims of others equally true, and, in their own place, equally important.

But why, if these evils are but two out of many "signs of the

times," are they singled out for special notice? For this reason:—Because they are two forms of sin marked out in the Word of GOD for special condemnation, and therefore as specially pernicious. "The LORD knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished; but *chiefly* them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government" (*κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας*), 2 S. Pet. ii. 9, 10. Many passages in this Epistle seem to point to these two classes of sins, as invested with peculiar malignity, and in some way specially indicative of the spirit of the last great apostasy. "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies (*αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*), even denying the LORD that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow out their lasciviousnesses (*ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις*); by reason of whom the way of [the] truth shall be evil spoken of (*βλασφημηθήσεται*), whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." "Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities—they shall utterly perish in their own corruption; and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the daytime. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: an heart they have exercised with covetous practices, cursed children (*κατάρας τέκνα*) . . . to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lust of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption." "There shall come in the last days scoffers in scoffing (*ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται*), walking after their own lusts and saying, Where is the promise of His coming?" Similarly S. Jude:—"There are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our GOD into lasciviousness, and denying the only LORD GOD and our LORD, JESUS CHRIST." "These filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities." "Beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the Apostles of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit."

The same connexion of ideas may be traced with more or

less distinctness in other places, as in the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians, and the pastoral Epistles; and though many of these passages primarily referred, no doubt, to earlier forms of heresy, such as the Nicolaitanes, Gnostics, Valentinians, &c., still, as these were but early manifestations of the "*ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ*," who were fore-shadows and precursors of him who is emphatically "*Ὁ Ἀντίχριστος*," so was their spirit but a modified form of his.

There is something exceedingly remarkable in the way in which lawlessness and sensuality are laid at the root of all other sins by S. Paul in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. First, the rebel rejection of God and His service; next, as its immediate consequent, the abysses of impurity; lastly, as the mediate result, all the long catalogue of wickednesses with which the chapter concludes. And in the 2nd Epistle to S. Timothy, iii. 1—8, when drawing a similar picture of what yet remains to be revealed, the Apostle adds, that of this sort are the false and seducing teachers "who creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts;" men who "resist the truth, of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith:" so leading us on to the plainer delineations of their character by S. Peter and S. Jude.

There is assuredly a most solemn and profound spiritual truth involved in the words, "*but chiefly* them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government;" as though these two principles were a deadly double root of sin, the embodiment and quintessence, so to speak, of all ungodliness. Against them, therefore, wherever and whenever found, the Church should always be peculiarly on her guard, to eradicate them from her own body, and to oppose them in the world in which she has been set as the purifier and witness for God.

But on what principles should this be done? What is the great counter principle which must be upheld against this two-fold enemy? How shall she best comply with the maxim *Principiis obsta?* How strike directly at the root of this upas-tree?

Before these questions can be answered satisfactorily we must endeavour to ascertain what is the cause of the awfully pernicious character of these sins; also, how it comes to pass that they are in such close and fatal alliance; what, if we may say so, is the central point of the divine economy to which they are so essentially antagonistic; and what is the nature of that antagonism. I am well aware that this is a subject of great and manifold difficulty: I do not know whether I should have

ventured to touch upon it but for the hope that some more competent hand might be induced to take it up, and do it the justice which its importance merits. In this hope I write these pages.

In the first place, however, let me invite a little closer attention to the light which Holy Scripture throws on the fact, that there is a mysterious alliance between these radical principles of evil. Of course in one sense, and that the widest sense, it is a fact which scarcely needs proof. If, for instance, we take "living after the flesh" as a symbol of self-indulgence in general, and this as the mere expression of self-love and self-pleasing, as antagonistic to the love and pleasing of GOD, that is, as equivalent to a repudiation of His Fatherhood and Lordship, the two vices may be reduced to, and expressed by, the common term of self-will, which is obviously the motive principle of all sin, as being the direct contrary of our LORD'S rule of perfect obedience — "FATHER, not My Will, but Thine." And, indeed, so far as concerns "despising government," it is perhaps neither easy nor necessary to bring it within narrower limits. All government, authority, and dignity is an effluence from the Divine Lordship, and, within its appointed sphere, the representative of His Will. The elementary truth of religion, that there is One GOD, the Maker and Monarch of all things created, is as absolute and unlimited as it is elementary. Wherever any authority exists, it is His, and from Him: to despise it, is to despise Him, and to rebel against the primary duty of a creature towards its Creator. The difficulty, then, whatever it may be, lies, I apprehend, in the other branch of the subject. For it is evident that "to live after the flesh" is used by the Apostle, not in the general sense of any sensual gratification, but in that only to which it is expressly limited—"the lust of uncleanness." And there is a very great *primâ facie* difficulty in accounting for the special malignity of this kind of sin. It is true, as divines have ever taught, that these sins, in a manner above all others, shut out GOD from the soul, deaden every spiritual affection and perception, and lead to dreadful crimes of other kinds, particularly, as was mentioned by Canon Humble, in his Essay on Infanticide, to cruelty and deeds of violence[1].

[1] "Theologically considered," he says, "it is quite impossible to dissociate cruelty, which is the immediate cause of this species of murder, from the vice which nurses it. There is a subtle connexion between lust and cruelty which no metaphysical inquiry can satisfactorily explain. How came the two passions to be so closely connected? The theologian will tell you that no passion indulged so effectually shuts out the vision of GOD as does lust. The moment man sinned he became ashamed. The master passion imme-

It is also true, that those who give themselves up to profligacy assimilate themselves, in the Apostle's words, to "natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed," till they "utterly perish in their own corruption." But why should such awful effects, physical, mental, moral, spiritual, be attached to this particular class of sins beyond all others? Can we hope to gain any light on this problem, or must we leave it, wholly unsolved, among the unfathomable judgments of God?

Returning to Holy Scripture, we find lawlessness and impurity in close alliance from the beginning, involving both individuals and nations in terrible guilt and signal punishment. The very first sin introduces us in a singularly suggestive manner to this phenomenon:—"She took of the fruit, and did eat; and gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons." This was the "evil" which the tempter too truly promised them that they should know. Yet there is something strange and perplexing in the immediate effect of their disobedience assuming this form. We might have expected many other results, but scarcely this. They had always been naked; they had known no other state. What was there in the act of disobedience to make that special condition of their existence no longer tolerable? And why did they not seek to clothe themselves wholly, if at all? To such inquiries Holy Scripture gives no direct answer; but "they knew that they were naked." It was in the form of conscious impurity that the Evil One seems to have immediately taken possession of his prey. There must have been some foreordained reason for this. Milton in some measure seized the idea, and developed it in his own way, in the ninth book of *Paradise Lost*, in the passage commencing—

> "They swim in mirth, and fancy that they feel
> Divinity within them breeding wings
> Wherewith to scorn the earth; but that false fruit,
> Far other operation first displayed,
> Carnal desire inflaming," &c.

The longer we reflect on the mystery of the introduction of sin of this description, the more we feel ourselves to be standing on the threshold of a deep spiritual problem, the solution of

diately declared its dominance."—(*The Church and the World*, 1st Series, p. 51.) In the "connexion between the two passions," however originating, we again trace the intimate relation of lawlessness to sins of the flesh. I wish the Canon could have pursued the subject further.

which must be sought further back than the actual introduction into the world of that corporeal human nature which seems at first sight to be absolutely essential to its existence. The difficulty lies here. Other types of sin, e. g. pride, discontent, malice, envy, disobedience, ingratitude, idolatry, and the like, are such as we can readily perceive to be compatible with a purely spiritual subsistence; and we are at no loss to discover the essential element in the divine perfections to which they are contraries; but in regard to sins called distinctively and characteristically "of the flesh," it is far from easy to find the link connecting them with simple spirit, from the absence of the medium which at once gives them their name and points to their specific nature. How can we, apart from all material associations, grasp a definite idea of abstract purity or impurity? While, therefore, we know that the Divine Nature is essentially antagonistic to every form of evil, and while we speak of Its infinite purity as intolerant of all iniquity, it is, perhaps, impossible to realize any quality in the Godhead to which sins of the flesh, and, specifically, sins of uncleanness, stand in the relation of direct logical contradictories. Nor, apart from all *a posteriori* arguments from the acknowledged results of such sins, and from the positive commandments of God, is it easy to say wherein their essential sinfulness *in genere* consists. That is to say, if we are to believe not merely that they are sinful because God has forbidden them, but that He has forbidden them because they are contrary to His Own essential Holiness, it is not easy, nor perhaps possible, to see how they come to be sinful at all. Consequently, it is most difficult to conceive of any quality of the Divine Likeness which Adam would have lost by his disobedience, the forfeiture of which would have impressed him with the consciousness of what we now call impurity; unless there were some pre-existing human standard from which he might have been made instinctively to feel himself fallen, and by falling from that to have also fallen from the Image of God. Difficult, then, as this may be if we search for a direct antagonism in these sins to the Nature of pure Godhead, much of the difficulty will disappear if we remember that in consequence of the Incarnation, human nature, equally with the Divine, has become the Nature of God; for it is far easier to conceive of sins of the flesh as *directly* antagonistic to His Essence of which humanity is an undivided part, and so *indirectly* through Him, by virtue of the indissoluble Unity of the Eternal Trinity, to the whole Substance of the Godhead, than to apprehend them as in essential and direct opposition to abstract Divinity itself, without the intervention of any such medium common to both

God and man. For this reason, then, I suspect we should seek for the rationale of their wickedness in their relation to the doctrine of God Incarnate, rather than in any other condition of Godhead.

This hint must suffice for the present: I shall have occasion to return to it further on. Meanwhile we will rapidly glance at a few of the more striking Scriptural illustrations of the connexion between sensuality and lawlessness, and of their tendency to provoke the special vengeance of God.

Following closely on the primal act of rebellion and the consequent ingress of impurity, we come, in Cain, to lawless violence and blasphemy. These two sins are prominently stamped on the first pages of the history of our race. It is worth a passing notice, though I would lay no stress on it, that the next instance of recorded sin seems in some measure to combine the two. It is the case of Lamech, of whom two facts only are written; 1st, That he had departed from the original law of marriage, having two wives; 2nd, That he was a murderer. Then comes Enoch, the prophet of judgment, denouncing the "ungodly deeds which they ungodly committed, and all the hard speeches which ungodly sinners had spoken against" the Lord Christ. The general nature of the "ungodly deeds" we know from the context in S. Jude. After Enoch, we are brought, *per saltum*, to the culmination of evil in the universal iniquity of the world, which provoked and heralded in the Flood. And from among all kinds of human wickedness two enormities stand out prominently; these same two in close union. They are clearly indicated in the opening of Genesis vi., and are summed up in verses 11—13. "The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before Me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth." Comparing this with our Lord's allusion to this time in S. Matthew xxiv. 37—39, we shall be disposed to allow that, though they may, no doubt, be merely descriptive of a general state of careless and carnal security, there is something in Dr. Maitland's suggestion—"That there may be a significancy in our Lord's words which has not been commonly observed. It seems natural that the eating and drinking should form a feature in the character of the gigantic sons of violence and sin, and that it should be followed by every species of outrage; but, perhaps, we should hardly have expected the mention of marrying. At all events, it is more easily understood, if we

consider it as relating to marriages essentially unlawful, and of such a character as to have called for the impending visitation." (*Essay on False Worship*, p. 25.)

It is a fact, then, as remarkable as it is suggestive, that up to the time of the Deluge no mention is made of any sins (after the first act of disobedience, which was itself a sin of lawlessness) but these two under various forms; and with the destruction evoked by them the second chapter of the world's history closes. Unhappily, however, only to reveal the same again at the opening of the third. Whether or not the drunkenness and immodesty of Noah be regarded as wilful, the sins to which they gave immediate occasion, and which drew down a curse on Ham and his descendants, were indecency and irreverence, showing that the two great floodgates of evil were still open for the pollution of the renovated world.

From this time, though many other forms of sin take their place in the sacred annals, these two continue to stand out in union in some of the most terrible events on record. For example, the next most signal instance of vengeance is the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, whose inhabitants "were wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly" in these two particulars. Passing onwards, we come to the Divine command utterly to exterminate the Canaanites and other nations of Palestine, because of their hideous idolatries (the climax of rebellion against GOD), and the sins enumerated in Leviticus xviii. :—"Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants." Then again, passing by the almost utter annihilation of the tribe of Benjamin, (the heaviest calamity that ever befell a single tribe of Israel before the Captivity), the punishment of the chosen people, the seventy years' durance in Babylon, was specially provoked by the same sins; the inveterate rebellion of the whole nation, the terrible corruption of their morals witnessed to by the prophets; and in a peculiar manner the violence and blood-guiltiness, the awful idolatries and abominations, "worse than the heathen whom the LORD had destroyed before the children of Israel," of the long reign of Manasseh, "which the LORD would not pardon." Once more, the cause of the second and more terrible vengeance on the Jewish nation was the rejection, persecution, and murder of their GOD, which acme of lawlessness was combined with a deep hypocrisy and thinly-veiled sensuality, which drew down on

them the severest rebukes, as a "sinful and adulterous generation;" words which, whatever their spiritual meaning, I see no reason for refusing to take in their literal sense. At the same time their favourite teachers were denounced as "whited sepulchres, full of all uncleanness," "full of hypocrisy and lawlessness;" whose secret sensualities were so grievous that on one notable occasion, out of a number fortuitously gathered together, it was demonstrated that not even one was free from guilt. It is worth noticing also, that, with an awful impiety paralleled in our own days, these men, as far as they dared, sought to fasten on the CHRIST Himself these very characteristics of the spirit of Antichrist. He was popularly said to be in league with "Beelzebub, the prince of the devils," and to be Himself demoniacally possessed; He was accused of "stirring up the people," "perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar;" He was blasphemed in His moral character as a sensualist, "a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners," a comrade of the most degraded and abandoned persons. "These things hast thou done, and I held My tongue, and thou thoughtest wickedly that I am even such a one as thyself."

The instances thus briefly enumerated are among the most remarkable examples recorded in Holy Writ, and they lead us on from period to period to the predicted development of the same double iniquity to be specially manifested towards the end, and to the denunciation that on such sinners "chiefly" GOD will execute judgment.

It will be noticed that no mention has hitherto been made of one very striking instance to which our attention is pointedly drawn in the Epistles of S. Peter and S. Jude. It is an instance all the more remarkable from its being placed among the typical examples of GOD'S wrath against the sins I am speaking of, and with direct reference to the punishment reserved for gross offenders therein. I refer, of course, to the sin of the Angels mentioned in the 2nd Epistle of S. Peter ii. 4, and in that of S. Jude 6, 7; and I take it last because it is very peculiar in itself, and also in the questions which it suggests. On these passages in the Apostolic Epistles I may say in general that, after having been for a long time strongly opposed, on obvious grounds, to the notion that the Angels are here actually charged with carnal sins, I have at length felt compelled to accept that opinion with all its difficulties as the one which most fairly and truly expresses the mind and meaning of Holy Scripture.

I very much regret that the necessity for economizing space

forbids me to state the argument at length. Those who are interested in the subject will find a great deal to the purpose in Dr. Maitland's *Eruvin* and *Essay on False Worship;* there are also some valuable remarks and references from a very different theological quarter, in Dean Alford's *Prolegomena* and *Notes* to the Epistle of S. Jude. The summary of their conclusions may be stated thus:—A close consideration of the argument of S. Peter, compared both in its points of agreement and difference with that of S. Jude, and the grammatical construction of the passages in the original Greek, irresistibly point to the conclusion (1) That these sins of the flesh are laid to the charge of Angels, though not necessarily to those which fell with Satan at first; or, if to them, then to a subsequent and still further fall of a portion of them. (2) That this sin is connected with the Deluge, as, in some manner, a cause of that judgment. (3) As a distinct result, that, in reasonable probability, Genesis vi. 1—4 refers to the same event. Because (4) the title, "sons of God," there used, most likely designates Angels. Which is inferred (5) from (*a*) that invariable use of the phrase in the Old Testament; (*b*) the constant tradition of the Jewish Church and writers; (*c*) the testimony of the LXX., who translated it "Angels," according to the majority of ancient MSS., as S. Augustine testifies, while dissenting from that view; (*d*) the agreement herein of the Codex Alexandrinus; (*e*) the *very decided* preponderance of Primitive Christian authority on the same side: (6) the utter groundlessness of the popular notion, that by the "sons of God" are meant the descendants of Seth, and by the "daughters of men" those of Cain. Dr. Maitland exposes with lucid and pungent sarcasm the tissue of gratuitous assumptions on which this Sethite theory is founded: which being disposed of, there is really no other hypothesis ready as an alternative to the angelic interpretation.

All, however, that is material to my present purpose is this:—Following many of my betters, I understand the Epistles of S. Peter and S. Jude to teach us that Angels have sinned by rebellion and impurity, and have been punished for them so signally as to be placed in the same category with the antediluvian world and the cities of the plain. I think it most probable, though not absolutely certain, that Genesis vi. 2 refers to the same events; and, if so, it is noticeable that the two great apostasies, past and future, preparing the way for the two destructions of the race, are closely connected with a terrible development of lawlessness and sensuality, very much through the agency of evil spirits.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I should wish to say a few words on two difficulties; viz., the apparent impossibility to

incorporeal essences of (1) the act, (2) the desire, of sins of the flesh. No one, I think, can feel the pressure of these difficulties more than myself. For the first, however, GOD'S Word is answer enough. It seems to say that it was so, and I believe it. *How* it was, we are not told; and we are at liberty to adopt any theory consistent with the fact, which may reduce the difficulty to a *minimum*. I cannot accept the theory of phantasmal or "aerial" bodies, because it does not in the least degree meet the real exigencies of the case, which appears to require their physiological identity, at least in some most important particulars, with our own. And how, without a special miracle of creation, they could have provided themselves with true living human bodies, I do not see; though we know so little of the properties and powers of matter and spirit, that, in S. Augustine's words, *non audeo temere definire*. Still, may it not be an allowable inquiry whether an intensified degree of demoniacal possession of living men might not remove many difficulties and satisfy all necessary conditions? Scripture gives examples of the extraordinary power, almost amounting to absolute identification, exercised by demons over the possessed; the separate individuality of the sufferer being for the time, as it were, in abeyance, and his whole being, body and soul, becoming only a medium through which the indwelling spirit energized at will. Effects of the same general character have often been observed on a much smaller scale, and in another sphere, among the phenomena of mesmerism; and I see no sufficient reason why the evil Angels may not in some such way as this have become the instigators and active, though still but spiritual, participators in the crimes of the antediluvians. This also might help to account for the special mention of the beauty of "the daughters of men," because it might naturally exercise an influence over the passions even of demoniacs, though it is difficult to see how it could affect purely spiritual beings. We know, also, that possession at times communicated to the sufferer an extraordinary increase of bodily power; and it is not impossible that on some similar principle the offspring of unions formed under such circumstances might have been endowed (if such, indeed, was the case) with remarkable physical vigour.

The objection that an incorporeal nature cannot feel concupiscence is, to my mind, much more formidable; and, for my own part, were this essential to the hypothesis, I should perceive no way of answering it except by a mute reference to the words —"It is written." Of course we may say that as man can debase himself to brute passions, so perhaps may Angels to human passions. But, though we may argue from matter to matter,

it does not follow that we can from matter to spirit; and so the analogy would fail. As the objection stands, I think it insuperable; therefore I am disposed to look for the explanation of the sin elsewhere. I do not think that the Angels either did, or could, feel concupiscence; but may there not have been a deeper motive prompting their sin? Might it not have been part of a daring and comprehensive scheme for frustrating the purposes of God towards the whole human race? We are not, I think, left wholly to our imagination for a sufficient motive. From the creation of man it was clearly the determination of the Devil to ruin him. At the Fall he had apparently succeeded. But he found himself caught in his own toils. It was decreed against him that enmity should be between him and the woman, between his seed and her Seed, and that the Seed of the woman should bruise his head. Whether or not he fathomed the depth of the prediction, matters little. He knew, at all events, whereabouts his danger lay, and whence his great Enemy would rise. Is it an impossible supposition that he might have endeavoured to defeat the curse and escape his doom by one or both of these ways?—(1) By demonizing the whole human race, so as to involve it in the same destruction with himself; or (2) By raising for himself from the same race a human champion with demoniacal powers, capable of meeting on equal terms and perhaps vanquishing the promised Avenger, the mysterious Seed; in short, such an "Antichrist" as we are taught yet to expect before the war between the Dragon and the Seed of the Woman shall be finally fought out? And if this supposition be admissible, may we not suppose further that the one experiment was attempted, and all but succeeded, at the Deluge, while the other yet remains to be tried, and to fail?

This, or some similar rationale of this obscure fragment of sacred history, seems to have the advantage of removing it from an isolated and—I may say it reverently—scarcely intelligible position, into a definite and consistent place in the present Divine economy, and of bringing it into direct relation to the doctrine of the Incarnation, the centre of that economy. It is observable, moreover, that the double spirit of lawlessness and licentiousness is represented in the New Testament as in peculiar opposition to this cardinal doctrine. "There are certain men crept in unawares, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord, Jesus Christ." "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them; and many shall follow out their

lasciviousnesses." And S. John, speaking of the characteristic false doctrine of these Antichristian teachers, says, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of GOD: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of GOD: Every spirit that confesseth JESUS CHRIST come in the Flesh, is of GOD: and every spirit that confesseth not JESUS CHRIST come in the Flesh, is not of GOD: and this is the spirit of the Antichrist, of which ye have heard that it cometh, and even now already is it in the world." "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not JESUS CHRIST coming in the Flesh: this is the deceiver and the Antichrist." "Who is the liar, but he that denieth that JESUS is the CHRIST? This is the Antichrist, who denieth the FATHER and the SON." As, then, the characteristic moral heresy of the times of apostasy seems to be a combination of lawlessness and impurity, so their characteristic doctrinal heresy is a denial of the Incarnation in itself or its consequences: a heresy awfully prevalent, and frightfully on the increase now. S. John does not say only that the Antichristian spirit denies that JESUS CHRIST *is* come in the Flesh, but that it denies Him "come in the Flesh," which is much more. S. Peter and S. Jude show us licentious lawlessness in union with the denial of the LORD: S. Paul tells us that the Antichrist is emphatically "the lawless one:" S. John, that the rejection of CHRIST in the Flesh is the essential characteristic of the Antichristian spirit. There seems to be a peculiar congruity and connexion between this heresy and these moral vices, which will be particularly manifested at the great final apostasy, but is always "in the world." Would not this lend some additional probability to the opinion that the antediluvian corruptions, so fearfully typical of things to come, were in some way a special development of Satanic malice against the expected Deliverer? Be this as it may, the New Testament presents these three in such close connexion that we are naturally led to inquire what is its nature and whence it rises? What is the principle that ranges impurity and lawlessness in such deadly antagonism to the mystery of the Incarnation?

In a former part of this paper I have said a few words on the great metaphysical difficulty of associating the idea of carnal sin with a purely spiritual essence. So far as our notions reach, a corporeal medium seems indispensable. Hence the further difficulty of conceiving any quality of Essential Divinity to which it is a direct contradiction. S. Chrysostom argues that it is impossible for an incorporeal nature to feel concupiscence. But the mere negation of one quality is not necessarily equivalent to

the affirmation of its opposite; and, indeed, if it be dependent on corporeity, it is hard to see how purity could exist, as an independent objective principle, in any definite sense appreciable by the human mind, except in relation to corporeal beings: i. e., so far as concerns our present argument, to man. So that it would not exist by eternal necessity, but by virtue of the positive ordinance of God in reference to the creation of man, and the laws, principles, conditions, and design of that creation; the due observance of which in certain particulars constitutes purity, their neglect or violation impurity. Neither exists of necessity; but because it has pleased God to create a being under such conditions as to render their existence possible, and, as regards that being, necessary.

So far the argument would apply equally to all sins of the flesh; but impurity has a peculiar character which seems to belong exclusively to itself. It is this. Every other bodily sin is an excessive gratification of that which is in itself innocent. Sloth is an exaggeration of rest; surfeiting and drunkenness of the natural participation of food and drink. These vary with individuals, but according to the nature of each is the measure of his liberty; excess is in every case sinful. With impurity it is quite different. Passing by all sins out of the natural order, we find not only that the same act *in genere* is pure in one case and not in another, but that its unlawfulness is entirely independent of all considerations of degree. The man who might live for years in purity in Holy Matrimony, living unmarried commits an act of impurity but once, and is guilty of "deadly sin." All other bodily sins are of degree; excess in things lawful: these not of degree only but of kind; and that, although they may be outwardly precisely identical with actions most innocent and pure. Wherein, then, lies the vital difference? Here only; in the one case they are within the holy enclosure of Marriage, in the other without. And how does this become so momentous an arbiter of right and wrong, between things apparently identical? It would certainly be enough to say that such is God's Will and Commandment: that He has ordained that nothing shall be innocent in these things without the sanction of this holy estate. This is true; it is a necessary portion of the truth; but it is not the whole truth. If I mistake not, God has taught us much deeper truth than this. I do not mean that reason and experience have proved that the welfare of the whole framework of human society is bound up with the purity of domestic life which rests on marriage; though this is also true. But it is rather a witness to than an explanation of the fundamental

principle involved. It points towards a truth, but does not reveal it.

The real answer I believe to be this; and I give it at once, because it will connect several lines of the argument which have not yet been brought to a common centre. I believe, then, that as all these instincts of humanity have been subordinated by GOD to the rule and discipline of Holy Matrimony, on which, by general consent, the whole fabric of society rests; so also marriage has been expressly ordained by GOD to be not only a type and figure, but an actual reflection and perpetual witness on earth to the great mystery of the Incarnation, which is the grand characteristic of the present dispensation, and the foundation and fountain of the whole society of supernatural and spiritual humanity. So that every kind of impurity is a sin and rebellion against the mystery and law of marriage, and every offence against marriage is an antagonism and contradiction to the supreme archetypal mystery of the Incarnation.

In the course of the inquiry we shall see, I hope, how the principle of obedience is essentially involved in this doctrine, and how, accordingly, it is borne witness to by marriage; how, also, the principles of lawlessness and sensuality are brought into direct implacable hostility to both; and thus we shall find a key to several problems which have come in our way in the course of the foregoing pages.

First we must remember that, as the Nature of the Godhead is itself the glory and felicity of GOD, so the manifestation of that Nature in its infinite perfections is the end of all His works. All creation is the manifestation of the Creator, for Whose pleasure all things "are and were created." GOD Himself is the Beginning and End, the Centre and Circumference of all His works. Throughout all the ages He has been manifesting forth His glory, now in one, now in another of His numberless attributes. What are the "ages" of which Holy Writ is full? May they not be a series of links, each complete in itself, yet all connected, each one a special manifestation of some one perfection of infinite perfectness? It is undoubtedly true of our own. Holy Scripture tells us that this is but one of many: it tells of the ages past and to come, as of the present age. We know that the special manifestation of Himself under which we live was planned and determined in the Divine Mind "before the ages." We know that GOD is here; and wherever He is, He must be First and Head, and the Centre of all His counsels. And we know that all things subordinate and ancillary to any special manifestation of Himself must have been foreseen and fore-ordained with express reference to it,

proceeding as it were from it as the great formal cause of all parts of the economy. There are no breaks, no flaws, no excrescences, no "after thoughts;" all follows the order of an ever uniform, divine, harmonious continuity. The more I consider the subject, the more persuaded I feel that, from the highest created spirit to the very dust of the earth, all creation is a parable, the interpretation of which is GOD. But with this glorious theme I have nothing to do here. What concerns us is this: that, if we can ascertain the particular form of divine manifestation which is the characteristic of the present age, we have the keynote of its entire harmony, the central point to which all parts of it are drawn, round which they revolve, and by which they are bound together into one perfect whole. And this we can do. This central point is undoubtedly the manifestation of GOD Incarnate to the glory of all His attributes, but especially that of Love. "GOD manifest in the Flesh" is the "great mystery of godliness," the mould and leaven of the dispensation of the present age. "GOD manifest in the Flesh," not for Himself, but that we through His Flesh may be raised up to oneness with GOD in Him. This is continually kept before our eyes in the New Testament as "the mystery" long concealed but now manifested, according to GOD'S eternal purpose, before the world began. I need not quote passages; but may refer as examples to Rom. xv. 25, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7—10; Eph. i. 3—11; Col. i. 25—27; 1 S. Tim. iii. 16; Eph. v. 29—32; S. John vi. 54—57; 1 Cor. xv. 47—49; S. John xvii. 21—24.

Taking, then, this point as granted, we find several indications that in some way or other the whole economy stands in relation to Him in that aspect. We read of Him that He Who is the Image of the invisible GOD is "the Firstborn of every creature, for by Him were all things created, all things were created by Him and for (towards) Him, and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist." And; "it pleased the FATHER to make all fulness dwell in Him, and through Him to reconcile all things to Himself, whether they be things on earth or things in the heavens." Again; He speaks of Himself as the "Beginning of the creation of GOD." Again; such passages as—"our LORD JESUS CHRIST, through Whom are all things;" and again, "by Him GOD made the worlds." Of course I have not forgotten the theological explanation of some of these statements, viz., that by virtue of the Hypostatic Union actions are attributed to GOD Incarnate in one nature which in strict propriety of speech are attributable to Him only in the other. But what I contend for is not opposed to this; it depends on it, and they illustrate each other. Because,

I think, such expressions show that though the Incarnation was a mystery manifested in a certain appointed place in the dispensation, it was in the eternal counsels of GOD the basis and governing principle of the whole; and because it was so ever-present and actually existing to Him it has a living relation to every part of the economy, and actually belongs to it throughout its every period. Therefore, though through suffering He entered into His Kingdom, He was "appointed Heir of all things" from all eternity, and said of Himself before His Passion:—"All things have been delivered unto Me of My FATHER;" and again before His Ascension:—"All power has been given unto Me in heaven and earth." And so said David in revelation no less than in prophecy:—"The LORD said unto my LORD, Sit Thou on My right hand." It was a thing equally belonging to the past, the present, and the future. It was a mystery long hidden yet ever accomplished; and so from the ages of the ages Incarnate GOD was the Ruler and Sovereign of the world and LORD of this dispensation.

The next point is this:—If our LORD in His humanity be in this sense "the Beginning of the creation of GOD," "the Firstborn of every creature," then humanity itself was created with primary reference to Him, as a nature fore-ordained to be united indissolubly with His own. In all its parts, body, soul, and spirit, it must be regarded as called into being *primarily* in order to that Hypostatic Union. First in order of dependence, though not of manifestation in time, stands the Humanity of GOD. *That* was the Archetype of all humanity; and CHRIST JESUS Himself was the Archetypal Man. His Humanity was the mould in which all others were to be cast; for "He is before all things: and in Him all things consist." And this gives additional significance to the wonderful words, "Let Us make man in Our Image;" and, "In the Image of GOD made He him." The Image of the Triune GOD, as one undivided whole, comprised Humanity as well as Divinity; and in this Image, corporeally and spiritually, man was created. Man was made after the model of Incarnate Godhead.

And now, with this in our mind, let us examine the story of his creation a little more closely.

Adam was made first and alone out of the dust of the earth; and this was the solitary act of creation which GOD pronounced to be "not good." "It is not good that the man should be alone." It was so far an imperfect, incomplete work. Wherefore out of his side, from man himself, in man's own nature and likeness, and therefore mediately in GOD's through him, He made

the woman, and having joined them together into one, then, and not till then, the creation of man was complete. "And behold *all* was very good." Another thing is remarkable. Three times in reference to the creation of man, and in reference to that only, it is written—"Male and female created He them." It points significantly to the principle of duality. But with equal significance to that of unity; for the singular and plural numbers are markedly interlaced:—"Let Us make man (singular), and let *them* have dominion." "God created man in His Own Image: in the Image of God created He him; male and female created He them." "This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the Likeness of God made He him; male and female created He them, and called their name (not names) Adam, in the day when they were created." It is the principle of duality in unity making one perfect whole. No longer incomplete and imperfect, "not good," but a finished, perfected, and "very good" humanity. Duality in unity is set forth as the perfect type of a humanity "created in the Image and Likeness of God." In which we may note one or two things. First, that neither male nor female *alone* represents perfect human nature. I do not mean physically or physiologically (for these distinctions belong to the temporary "body of our humiliation"); but psychologically and morally. There are real differences between man and woman here; qualities of the intellect, of the heart, of the emotions; which, more or less common to both, are developed in them unequally, so as to make each the complement of the other. In marriage, in the family, in friendship, in the daily duties of society, we find this true. The two classes of characteristics, united in their just proportions, make up the perfect idea of human nature. The more closely they are united in one person the nearer he approaches that idea. It is *fully* realized only in the Archetype, in Whom alone humanity centres in all its abstract perfectness, in THE MAN, Jesus Christ, God Incarnate. And next notice this: that the principle of duality in unity which constitutes perfect manhood is the essential principle of the being of the Archetypal Man. Godhead alone is an imperfect Christ; Manhood alone is an imperfect Christ; but "God and Man is One Christ," and so, in like manner, male and female is one man. "He called their name Adam, in the day when they were created." Thus, in the first principle of their creation, Adam was the type and parallel of "Him Who was to come." And further; the relation in which our humanity stands to the Godhead was shown forth in the relation of Eve to our Lord: for as Adam was created in

the Image of Godhead, not immediately but mediately through the Image of GOD Incarnate, so the woman was made in the Image of GOD Incarnate, not immediately but mediately through the man: and by these steps she too ascended to the Image and Likeness of GOD, for "the head of the woman is the man; and the Head of the man is CHRIST; and the Head of CHRIST is GOD."

But the teachings of the Creation carry us much beyond this. I have said the complete idea of humanity is not the male or female alone, nor even, I may add, side by side, but in union. Just as the complete idea of CHRIST is not the Godhead or the Manhood alone, nor, as it were, side by side, as Nestorius feigned, but in union, true, perfect, indissoluble. The Hypostatic Union was not an act distinct from, and superadded to, the creation of our LORD'S Humanity, though the ideas may be metaphysically distinguishable; the "preparation" of His Body was not apart from His taking the Body prepared for Him. The two combined in one operation, the marriage of Divinity and Humanity, constituted the Incarnation. So also at the creation of man. The woman was not only made, she was also united to the man, and this union was the final act in their joint creation. "The rib which the LORD GOD had taken from man made He a woman, *and brought her unto the man*. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh . . . . therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." It was the complex act of GOD, "making and bringing," that made them one "Adam." Their marriage was the completion of their creation. "And they shall be one." It is worth notice with what emphasis this is incidentally insisted on by S. Paul, when he is not placing the man and woman in contrast, but drawing a parallel between Adam and our LORD. "By one man sin entered into the world;" "by the offence of one many be dead;" "the judgment was by one to condemnation;" "by one man's offence death reigned by one;" "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." It cannot be accidental, for it is of the essence of the argument; the force of the whole lies in the parallelism between "one" and "One;" a dual unity in both cases, but unity as the dominant idea in both.

But now consider what I may call the marriage formula of Adam and Eve:—"And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his

father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." These were the words of Adam. But they were also the words of GOD. "Have ye not read," says our LORD, "that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh? *Wherefore* they *are* no more twain, but one flesh." They were GOD'S words through Adam, announcing both the law of Marriage and also another mystery with which it was in essential connexion, to be revealed and interpreted afterwards. As thus:—"He that loveth his wife loveth himself, for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the LORD the Church: for we are members of His Body, [made out] of His Flesh and [out] of His Bones; for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This mystery is great, but I speak concerning CHRIST and the Church." This expression, "a great mystery," here applied primarily to Marriage, occurs but once more in the sacred writings; and there in reference to the Incarnation, "Great is the mystery of Godliness, GOD was manifest in the Flesh:" "A happy coincidence," says Dr. Wordsworth, "teaching a divine truth. The word 'mystery,'" he adds, "as used by S. Paul, signifies something kept *secret* and *hidden*, and generally something *sacred* and *divine*, which cannot be discovered by natural reason, but is unfolded by divine revelation." Of such a nature is the relation of Holy Matrimony to the Incarnation. The argument runs thus:—Even as CHRIST loves Himself in loving the Church, so a man loves himself in loving his wife; for she is his flesh as we are CHRIST'S Flesh; and this, which is a great mystery concerning CHRIST and the Church, is the cause of man leaving his parents, and being united into one flesh with his wife: which last words, moreover, have evidently a double reference to the two mysteries in question. So, then, the first recorded words of man were spoken by direct inspiration of GOD, prophetically setting forth the Incarnation of His SON, and declaring it to be the cause, lawgiver, and archetype of the lower but cognate mystery of human Marriage. But as there is no natural necessity for the two things to bear such relation to each other, we can only suppose it to be so by the express appointment of GOD, designing the higher to be the *fons et origo* of the lower, and the lower to be the representation and reflection of the higher. And it is wonderful how true, notwithstanding its necessary feebleness, that reflection is. So intensely close is their mutual connexion that, as we have seen, S. Paul, writing to the

most spiritual of Churches, so interweaves them that it is scarcely possible to detach what is said of one from what of the other. He speaks of both together under a common formula; and when we might think from the familiar words that he is referring only to what is human, he tells us that it is a great mystery, having no less reference to that which is divine. And then, seeming to check himself, as though he might have said yet more, he abruptly descends to a plain practical commandment, that the husband should love his wife, and the wife reverence her husband.

The deeper we go the more wonderful harmonies we discover. It must be remembered that the Incarnation did not terminate in the Hypostatic Union. It was for our sakes, "for us men and for our salvation." Hence we find that it has a three-fold aspect, and, so to speak, attains its full measure by three successive stages. I. The Hypostatic Union itself, the initial marriage of Godhead and Humanity. II. Its Sacramental extension into all the members of CHRIST, by which each one is severally wedded to His Adorable Humanity, and gathered up into Himself as "a member in particular" of His Own Body. III. The consummation of the Incarnation at the "Marriage of the LAMB," when the Church shall be corporately received to Himself in the full meaning of the words, "the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are One: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in One."

All these aspects are more or less reflected in Holy Matrimony. We shall most easily see something of this, perhaps, if we take language primarily belonging to the lower mystery, and note its applicability, even down to minute details, to the higher; remembering that in the analogy of marriage to the Incarnation in its first aspect, the husband corresponds to the Godhead, the wife to the Manhood: in the second and third aspects, the husband corresponds to GOD Incarnate, the wife to the particular member or the whole body of the Church.

Take then, as an example, 1 Cor. xi. 7—9. 11, 12, which I give in a type more clearly illustrating the idea I wish to convey. "MAN is the Image and glory of GOD; but the Woman is the glory of the MAN. For the MAN is not of the Woman; but the Woman of the MAN. Neither was the MAN created for the Woman; but the Woman for the MAN. . . . Nevertheless neither is the MAN without the Woman, neither the Woman without the MAN, in the LORD. For as the Woman is of the MAN, even so is the MAN also by the Woman; but all things of GOD." A little careful examination by the devout reader will

show not only the beautiful spiritual significance, but the marvellous theological precision of this passage, in reference to the Incarnation and its objects.

Or again, let us take passages from our own Marriage Office, which speaks of the consecration of Marriage to such an excellent mystery that in it is signified and (which is much more) represented the spiritual Marriage and unity betwixt CHRIST and His Church; and, more than this, teaches us to attribute to it such exceeding holiness, that by it GOD "sanctified" our first parents even while perfectly sinless. From this Office let us take the solemn acceptance of the state and duties of Marriage, and apply them, in the first place, with all reverence, to that mysterious point in the decrees of GOD when, knowing all that would befall the humanity He was about to create, the Eternal FATHER took counsel, as it were, with the Co-eternal SON, as to His reception of that humanity to accomplish the purposes of the Ever-blessed TRINITY in its creation. I write with all reverent earnestness, trusting that no one will take occasion to mock or blaspheme: —"Wilt THOU have this Woman to THY wedded Wife, to live together after GOD's Ordinance, in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt THOU love her, comfort her, honour, and keep her in sickness and in health? and, forsaking all other, keep THEE only unto her, so long as Ye both shall live?" The MAN shall answer, "I will." And then the fulfilment in the Incarnation itself:—"I take thee to MY wedded Wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death Us do part, according to GOD's holy Ordinance; and thereto I plight thee MY troth." Lastly, this:—"With this Ring I thee wed, with MY Body I thee worship, and with all MY worldly goods I thee endow: In the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. Amen."

Such are the terms of the marriage covenant made by GOD with man. And is not all this the very strictest, almost literal, truth? Did He not take our nature, and particularly the Church, "never to be divided" from her; to take that which was worst in her, her sins; to give her what was better, His Godhead and Holiness; to share her vicissitudes, embrace her poverty, that she, "through His poverty, might be made rich;" bear her sicknesses, that He might dower her with health, even His own Immortality; love her "with an everlasting love;" "cherish her" in His Divine Heart ("even as the LORD the Church," says S. Paul, making it the reality rather than the figure); and, forsaking all other, keep only unto her ("for verily He took

not on Him the nature of Angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham") as long as both should live, even for evermore (for, "because I live, ye shall live also")? Has He not wedded her with the Ring of His Eternity, His Name, His Home, His Glory, and "all His Goods?" Has He not done her worship with His Body, in pain, and toil, and weariness; in weeping, and watching, and agony, and bloody sweat; in wounds, in buffetings, in shame, in stripes; on the cross, and in the grave; "faithful and true" to His Bride, even unto death? Does He not still give her the very same Body and Blood for her daily bread and daily healing, to feed, refresh, cleanse, strengthen, and sanctify her? Is He not her Comforter and Defender, her Shield and Guide, her Praise and Glory, her Light, her Life, her LORD, her Love, her All, her Own; in Whom, and by Whom, and for Whom, and to Whom Alone she lives, and moves, and has her being; His Own, and not another's, "to bring forth fruit unto" Him, her "GOD?" This was His covenant with her "according to GOD's holy Ordinance; and thereto He plights her His troth."

And on her part is the covenant of "obedience, and service, love, honour," and pure fidelity; in sorrow and gladness, sunshine and storm, faintness and vigour, trouble and repose, necessities and abundance; to own no lord, no love, no husband but Him; to feel His feelings, think His thoughts, will His will; to sacrifice self wholly and exultingly to His Love; to joy in His joys, suffer in His sufferings, cherish Him in her heart of hearts; to count all rest weariness, which is not in Him; all comfort unfaithfulness, if apart from Him; all weariness rest, which is for Him; to mourn after Him when He hides Himself, watch for Him, and with Him; to count it all joy to bear in her own heart and body the marks of her LORD; to be nothing in herself, but He all in her; to "live no longer herself," but He in her; to nestle nearer and nearer to His loving heart; to forsake all other, and keep only unto Him; and to rejoice in the hope of being perfected with Him in His eternal glory:—this is the portion of the Bride; "and thereto she gives Him her troth."

This is the real position of Universal Humanity by virtue of its Marriage with Godhead; this, still more, of every individual member incorporated into His Body; this, above all, of the "Elect Lady," the Holy Catholic Church, "the Mother of us all that bear the Name" of the Bridegroom. Before humanity had any visible existence, this was its place in the Divine economy; this its bounden duty and glorious heritage as the Bride of the Everlasting GOD.

And of this divine and heavenly mystery the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony was the ordained perpetual representation and witness on earth. "The Song of songs, which is Solomon's," however profaned by the carnal imaginings of men, is a written sacrament of both mysteries in one; and it is, perhaps, the most deeply spiritual book of the Old Testament Scriptures. So far as earthly things can follow the pattern of heavenly, there is but one law for both. "It is not good that the man should be alone," was GOD'S reason for the creation of Eve; and our LORD'S reason for the necessity of His Passion, when from His side, as He lay in a deep sleep on the Cross, the Church was taken in sacramental figure, was, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone." "I will make him," said GOD, "a help meet for him." "And," says the Apostle of the mystical "CHRIST," "the Head *cannot* say unto the feet, I have no need of you. Much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are *necessary*." For "the Woman was created for the MAN." So that to a very great extent we may argue fearlessly from the one to the other. Is the Hypostatic Union indissoluble? So also is Marriage. Know we that —"My Beloved is mine, and I am His?" So also "every man" must "have his own wife, and every woman her own husband." Community is abominable. Is it written, "My dove, My undefiled is but one?" Polygamy is sacrilege. Did GOD "call their name Adam in the day when they were created?" "So also is CHRIST." "And this is the name whereby she shall be called, 'The LORD our Righteousness.'" And as marriage is binding till death part the married, so also the man once united to CHRIST, remains united to Him for ever, unless by the death of his soul he sever the union, and "that which he hath is taken away from him."

So intimate, indeed, is the union between these mysteries that there is nothing relating to marriage unillumined by the reflected light of the Incarnation. What, for example, is the pure mutual love of man and woman, so wonderful that it has passed into a true proverb that "marriages are made in heaven," and that without it, as it is said, "he that hath no wife will wander up and down mourning," but the reflection of that divine Love by which He, Himself "the Desire of all nations," "hath chosen Zion, and longed for her," by which, or ever men were, His "delights were with the sons of men;" by which, in all the sadness of unrequited love, He mourned, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I—and ye would not?" So, on the other side, that which is written—"He that findeth a wife

beginneth a possession, a help like unto himself, and a pillar of rest," is but the reflection of His gladness Who says, "He will rejoice over thee with joy; He will rest in His love; He will joy over thee with singing:" Who, again, says of His Church, "This shall be My rest for ever; here will I dwell, for I have a delight therein."

But now, if all this be so, it will probably be objected:—Why is the doctrine of Marriage so clouded, distorted, deformed throughout the whole Old Testament dispensation? On the principles I am advocating it is just what would have been expected. The answer is—Because the doctrine of the Incarnation was not as yet manifested. It has already been remarked how, coincidently with the first act of rebellion against GOD, the integrity of the marriage relation received a strange and terrible shock. "Their eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked: and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons." I believe the real truth to be this: that by that sin the harmony of the Incarnation, the marriage relation of humanity to Godhead, was deranged, and the harmony and integrity of the earthly Marriage suffered responsively. In the first instant of sin, the sun in the heavens was suddenly overclouded and the clear mirror upon earth reflected the cloud. Humanity had not kept the covenant and love of its betrothal, and reserve, alienation, and partial obscuration of perfect union followed at once. And the cloud grew denser and darker from that time forward. Humanity went further and further astray from its Divine Husband and LORD; and *pari passu* the Marriage Union became more and more violated and profaned, till the whole world was filled with corruption and lawlessness: and then came the Deluge. Afterwards also the other judgments, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, of the Canaanites, of the tribe of Benjamin for the abominations of Gibeah, and all the dark list. Here and there along the ages came gleams of better and brighter things; the comparatively pure code of the Jews; the mystic teachings of Psalms, Canticles and Prophets; symbol, and foreshadow, and prediction of the coming Regenerator, the Second Adam, the Restorer of humanity to the perfect keeping of the bridal covenant of obedience and love; but never again, from the fall of the first Adam till the manifestation of the Second, did Holy Matrimony regain its due honour. At no one point of intermediate time would the sad reproof have been misplaced—"From the beginning it was not so." One bright sudden flash of light closed the prophetic record, a strange voice of burning indignation and thrilling warning, instinct with the presage

of the approaching restoration :—"This have ye done again, covering the altar of the LORD with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that He regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth it with good will at your hand. Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the LORD hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did not He make one? Yet had He the residue of the SPIRIT. And wherefore one? That He might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. For the LORD, the GOD of Israel, saith that He hateth putting away: for one covereth violence with his garment, saith the LORD of Hosts; therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously. . . Behold, I will send My Messenger, and He shall prepare the way before Me: and the LORD Whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His Temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant, Whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the LORD of Hosts." Striking and beautiful is the fact, in this connexion, that the first miracle of GOD in the Flesh, the first "manifestation forth of His glory" as the Regenerator of mankind, was wrought at the sanctification and glorification by His presence of a marriage-feast. His very first public act was to honour and redignify Holy Matrimony. From that time "GOD winked" no more at the times of ignorance: the cloud cleared away from the face of the Sun of Righteousness, and the reflection brightened anew. He taught plainly what He had done "in the beginning," when He made man "male and female;" and marriage thenceforth took its rightful place side by side with the doctrine of "GOD manifest in the Flesh," in the economy of "the Regeneration."

All this throws a vivid light on two points, to which brief reference must be made. First, the constant habit in the Old Testament of denouncing rebellion and apostasy from GOD, and particularly the running after idols, the "gods many, and lords many," under the image of conjugal unfaithfulness. It was, in truth, representing the sin in a faint but true photograph. For as to "obey and to serve" are among the essential duties of wife-hood (for "the head of the woman is the man"), an obedience born of love and pure union of will, and a service which for love's sake is perfect freedom, so are they essential duties of humanity brought into close relation to Godhead through the union of the Incarnation; for "the Head of every man is CHRIST, and the Head of CHRIST is GOD," since CHRIST Himself is "inferior to the FATHER as touching His Manhood." For CHRIST came to

be "obedient unto death," and He took on Him "the form" and the reality "of a servant." The Monothelite heresy would virtually overthrow this, by denying Him a true free human will; but it was through the faultless obedience of this human will, and its absolute union with the Divine Will to which it was wedded, that He was made perfect through sufferings, and exalted His and our humanity to the throne of glory in the Heavens. The subordination of humanity to Divinity in all aspects of the Incarnation is a subjection of man to GOD by the free, loving, perfect union of wills springing from a living, supernatural, intensely real personal union. Obedience is a fundamental principle of the Incarnation; therefore also of its reflection, Holy Matrimony; for the commandment is—"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the LORD; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as CHRIST is the Head of the Church. Therefore, as the Church is subject unto CHRIST, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing." In both cases the law is the same; and springs from the same root, duality in unity. Where two are united into one, and two wills are in one, and yet both free, there is no alternative: one must be head and the other must serve, not by constraint but willingly, with a perfect loving service. If not, there is discord and, so far, disruption of union. All disobedience to GOD is a violation of the marriage covenant of the Incarnation: so, too, is all disobedience to lawful authority on earth; yet not only so, but it is also a violation of the fundamental principles of social order and subordination, which are founded on the marriage union. For this is the fountain of family life; and the streamlets of families trickle down into the rivulets of tribes; and these flow together into the rivers of nationalities; and these, again, roll their united waters into the broad ocean of humanity at large. Expressed in another formula, all lawlessness is a breach of the fifth Commandment; and this is based on marriage, which is rooted in the Incarnation. All revolt of man from GOD, and especially open idolatry, is a revolt against authority springing from that heavenly marriage union, and its correlative obligation of obedient service.

The laws of the natural and spiritual humanities correspond both in basis and superstructure. The initial principle of the mystical humanity, which is "the CHRIST," is the Hypostatic Union of Divinity and Manhood; that of the natural humanity the union of the first man and woman in the "Adam." The developing principle of the one is "the increase of the body" supernatural by spiritual regeneration through sacramental extensions of the Incarnation; that of the other, the increase of

the body natural by continual fruitfulness through perpetual extensions of the sacrament of marriage. For it must not be forgotten, that according to the Will and ordinance of God, no other conditions of fruitfulness are allowable; and as the development of the mystical humanity is absolutely dependent on the increase of the natural, it is not too much to say that, according to the Will of God, the consummation of the Incarnation is, in some measure, made dependent on the cognate mystery of marriage; insomuch that the heretical doctrine of "forbidding to marry" is a scarcely indirect effort to stunt the increase of the Body of Christ. There is a mutual dependence of each on each; and this fact, simple and self-evident as it is, is a beautiful illustration of continuity from the kingdom of nature to that of grace. To say that, in fact, children are born unlawfully, by no means invalidates the argument; because it is quite as true that man's disobedience has with equal success laboured to thwart God's gracious purposes in the redemption of all mankind. In both alike God's Will has been opposed by man's will.

I think, then, that all departure of man from God is of the nature of adultery and lawlessness, not in figure only, but in actual spiritual fact; because it is a violation of the primal marriage vows between Godhead and Manhood; the repudiation of an authority flowing directly from their union. All sin partakes of this character; above all, open idolatry, which is the most shameless form of going after "other lovers" and "other lords."

And this leads up to another closely allied subject, viz., the connexion between idolatry and impurity. S. Paul, in the opening of his Epistle to the Romans, states the fact with emphasis:—"Because they changed the glory of the Uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things: Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, . . who worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator. . . For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections." The connexion between the offence and the retribution, broadly stated, would probably be this: As man, created bodily and spiritually in the Image of God, had renounced His service, and, as far as lay in him, defaced and destroyed one part of that Image, the spiritual; so, by just retribution, he was given over to defile and profane also the other, the bodily part, so that the degradation of his whole being might be complete. But I think this may be added; that because he had renounced the honour and glory of humanity, which is union with Divinity, God would no longer suffer him to retain the

representation of that mystery by a "knowledge" of Holy Matrimony. Man had resolutely darkened his soul against the Sun, and it was a "recompense that was meet" that he should be deprived of the witness of its earthly reflection. All those parts of human nature which with marked and definite purpose GOD had subjected to the law of Marriage, that by their strength and universality they might subserve to the perpetual maintenance of the Image of the Incarnation, and more perfectly set forth the mystery of its spiritual fruitfulness through sacramental reproduction, were suffered to break out into utter lawlessness, and sweep away in a torrent of pollution the representation and memorial of the Incarnate, Whom "they did not like to retain in their knowledge."

Nor can I think it at all unreasonable to believe that this sacrament is the object of the particular hatred of evil spirits, mainly because of this its spiritual character, and also because (which is an effluence from the other) it is the centre and foundation of social order and authority. To corrupt public morality in this stronghold of its power is the most deadly device for making society rotten to the very core, and preparing the way for all violence, lawlessness, and anarchy.

Under such circumstances as these the intimate connexion of impurity and idolatry need cause no surprise; indeed, it is rather what we might antecedently have expected; for in their origin they stand to each other almost in the position of complements, the one being to the body what the other is to the soul. It is but natural that the evil spirits who ceaselessly war against "GOD manifest in the Flesh" in the one way should do it in the other also; and by the two combined should endeavour to concentrate into a focus of perfect ungodliness the whole powers of man's being. I should even be prepared to find (though I have not studied the point sufficiently to be able to speak with any confidence) that, as a general rule, the grosser the form of idolatry the grosser would be the associated impurity; regarding in both not only the material forms of sin, but the light against which and the object for which it was committed. However this may be, I know nothing in which these sins (so estimated) culminated in such a frightful height of joint enormity as in certain witch-sabbats of the Middle Ages, wherein a Satanic parody of the Holy Eucharist (the great Sacrament of the Incarnation and a divine Antitype on earth of the Marriage Union) was combined with orgies of hideous licentiousness, as a compound act of direct renunciation of our LORD and worship of the Devil. If this be not to become "communicants of Devils" I know not what

can be. Were it still possible, in these later ages, as some persons have believed, and as S. Augustine would not undertake to deny, for demons to repeat the sin of the Angels before the Flood, one might imagine the Antichrist to be destined to spring from the revelries of some future "Rebel's Communion" and "Black Mass." "The mystery of iniquity doth" still "work."

All lawlessness, then, and disobedience I find to be a violation of the marriage covenant between GOD and Man, which is perfect obedience and perfect love through perfect union. It naturally leads to impurity, because marriage (against which every conceivable form of impurity is directly or indirectly a sin) is the reflection of the Incarnation, a standing witness to its nature and its truth, and the mediate fountain of all human law and order. Conversely, all impurity, being a sin against marriage, passes upward into sin against the higher mystery and marriage covenant of the Incarnation, and divorces manhood from its bridal vows of obedience and fidelity to its LORD. For "the body is not for fornication, but for the LORD; and the LORD for the body." In the depths of this mutual relationship lies, I believe, the true secret of the alliance between sins of the flesh and despising government, and of the connexion of both with the denial of "JESUS CHRIST come in the Flesh." And further; hence it is, I think, that, as in the days before the Flood, so in the last days before the end of all, the climax of Satanic fury against the REDEEMER and the redeemed will break forth especially in awful forms of unparalleled lawlessness and unparalleled uncleanness.

From all that has been said we may, I think, draw this conclusion, that one very powerful weapon against both forms of evil, moral and doctrinal, will be to uphold the full glory and dignity of Christian Marriage as a witness to the doctrine of the Incarnation of GOD. It will be found a mighty auxiliary to the other arms of the Church in contending against the spirit of sensuality and insubordination now prevalent and increasing in the world. Far from being a barren speculation, a mere fine-spun theory, it has a most direct practical bearing on these "Questions of the day." Here will be found the truest answer to the unenlightened sophism which, arguing from the permissions of the dark ages before the manifestation of CHRIST, pleads for the still further corruption of our civil law of marriage. Already terrible profanation has been perpetrated by the recent laws of divorce. Even the Judges who administer them have been appalled at the grossness of their results. The wicked attempt to legalize certain forms of incest, founded immediately

on the denial of the true and absolute unity of husband and wife, has nearly succeeded more than once; and, though at present crushed by the prayers and labours of the Church, will surely reappear at a more "convenient season." It must be confronted by an inflexible assertion that as "GOD and Man are One CHRIST," so husband and wife are one "Adam." The growing laxity of a sensual age has forbidden Christian Marriage to be the invariable law of this nominally Christian country; it could not be otherwise, without perpetual blasphemies and perjuries. All the more reason, therefore, is there for the Church faithfully to uphold it in all its deeply sacramental character. Let the clergy in every possible way try to shield it from profanation. Instead of constraining heretics to present themselves for union at the Altar of the LORD (as was done in one case not long ago made public), let them be more careful not to give that which is holy to the dogs. Above all, let clergy and laity do all in their power not only to give effect to the law of the Church, that "it is convenient that the new married persons should receive the Holy Communion at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage," but also to teach the faithful *why* it is "convenient," and what is the special relation between Holy Communion and Christian Marriage, through the Incarnation.

Let the World set light by these things if it will, but let it do so without excuse. We must not be afraid of speaking out. No doubt we shall be ridiculed as visionaries by all whose hold on the central doctrine of the faith is weak or treacherous; but we cannot help that. The way we would go is not the way of the World, but the way of CHRIST and the Church. Doubtless, all those great multitudes who represent popular opinion; all who regard marriage as little or nothing higher than a necessity of social respectability, or a constitutional way of providing for hereditary estates, of establishing oneself in life, or settling into a recognized position in the world; or who make it a matter of profitable return for investments in education and fashion, a question of social influence, family connexion, and worldly show, and of all the thousand and one considerations which group themselves round the worldly ideas of "the Hymenæal Altar:"—all these classes of persons will not understand us when we say that these things, however lawful in their proper places many of them may be, are altogether beside the chief honour and dignity of the Sacrament of Marriage, which consists in its connexion with the highest verities of dogmatic theology; in its being "a pattern of things in the heavens;" and in the fact

that all who are admitted into that holy estate enter into a sacred brotherhood, bearing a very special and intimate relation to their Incarnate LORD.

A few words embrace the whole matter. Against all who regard Holy Matrimony only as a legal and secular, or social estate, we must uphold it as a sacred Sacrament, inferior only to the two "twin Sacraments" of "the Gospel," belonging to the order of grace, no less than to the order of nature.

But to do this effectually we must begin at the beginning and lay our foundations anew. We must begin at our cradles, not with our grown men and women. We must teach our children and youth of both sexes that all purity is enshrined in the Humanity of GOD, and flows thence, and thence only, to man. That the main channel through which it flows, after the Sacraments which immediately unite us with our LORD, is the sanctifying discipline of Holy Marriage, founded on the Incarnation, deriving its being, character, and holiness from it, reflecting and representing it in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and so nearly related to it, that every offence against marriage is an aggravated offence against Him Who is Incarnate in their nature, and in themselves through sacramental union with Him. We must seek to make them know and realize that to make it the slave of sensual indulgence, is sacrilegiously to debase the nature which they bear in common with their GOD, and to do despite to that Ordinance under whose sanction alone all these impulses can preserve the purity of their original creation. For there are but two paths of perfect purity set before us by GOD, both holy and honourable estates in His Church—Celibacy for the few, Marriage for the many—each with its own distinctive glory, yet alike in their spotless undefiledness and saintly self-control. GOD have mercy on all who despise, and still more on those who profane either of them.

And this seems to be the proper place for a few words of needful caution, lest any should think that by our exaltation of marriage we depreciate the higher estate. It may be said, "If marriage is so high a mystery, if duality in unity is the normal perfection of man, if man or woman singly represents humanity but imperfectly, Marriage is more honourable than Celibacy, and our LORD would have embraced it as the nobler life." I answer—No. I do indeed believe, and plainly confess my belief, that the unmarried estate, *per se*, i.e. without any reference to "the kingdom of heaven's sake," *is* a lower state than that of Holy Matrimony; because, unless superseded by something higher, it is still GOD'S recorded declaration, "It is not good for the

man to be alone;" and because the man loses the honour of one estate without gaining that of the other. I believe that there are grades of honour here as hereafter, and that every man is called to his own order as it hath pleased GOD. I believe that all are called to perfection; but that that only is perfection for each individual man, which most perfectly represents and fulfils GOD's Will *for him*. I also venture to hope, that by an entire union of our will with GOD's Will, we may, at least sometimes, even in a lower vocation, attain the grace of making that which is inevitable our own free choice, and so obtain the reward of the higher. Therefore, I dare not rashly say that a man living in purity a compulsorily unmarried life from poverty or any other restraining cause, may not by special grace attain to the honour of holy Celibacy in the sight of GOD. But I speak now of ordinary cases; and in regard to them I believe marriage to be more honourable.

As to those, however, who have made themselves celibates "for the kingdom of heaven's sake," I know not how we can sufficiently venerate them. Nothing that I have said detracts from their peculiar dignity. Indeed, the principles of all that I have said argue the contrary. For what do they but, passing by the lower mystery of earthly marriage, attach themselves with intenser devotion to the higher, the spiritual marriage union with their GOD. For the love of the Antitype they forego the type; the beauty of the reflection, for a fuller portion in the reality of the substance. They hold themselves free from the temporal, with all its joys, and cares, and entanglements, that they may devote themselves, body, soul, and spirit to win a larger measure of the Eternal: that He may be their own, and they His, in all the fulness of which their created being is capable, they will see nothing, seek nothing, long for nothing, but Himself. Verily, "this is the heritage of the" chiefest "servants of the LORD."

As for the argument from the analogy of our LORD's earthly life, I confess, with all deference, I could never see much force in it. First, because His life, if any, was what it was wholly "for the kingdom of heaven's sake," and would therefore be the highest in the highest order. Next, because He Himself, by the necessary and fundamental law of His Incarnate Being, was the Embodiment and Fulfilment, the Alpha and Omega, the First Principle and the "*Consummatum est*" of the Marriage Mystery. He Himself was in Himself the visible manifestation of Holy Matrimony. For this mainly, and for other reasons which reverence must leave veiled, I cannot regard the hypothesis of

His earthly Marriage, except as a theological paradox and essential impossibility. But it is time to return.

As those whom GOD calls to holy celibacy are comparatively few, it is worse than madness to allow our youth to grow up with low and irreverent thoughts of that other state, in which lies their only ordinary hope of an undefiled life. From their earliest years every thing connected with marriage should be presented to them as invested with a sacred character, to be treated with loving and holy reserve, not to be profaned by "idle talking and jesting which are not convenient." As they grow older they should be taught that marriage, so far from being a concession to human infirmity, a legitimate channel for the indulgence of otherwise illegitimate passions, is a holy sacramental mystery, empowered to subdue, control, sanctify them, and make them servants of GOD, ministers towards the extension of His SON'S Deified Humanity. They should learn also (and this will apply more especially to young men) that it is as easy to sin *in* marriage as *out* of it; that, perhaps, in the whole course of their spiritual life, they will find prayer, vigilance, confession, firm unflinching self-discipline, the mighty strengthening of the HOLY SPIRIT and the sacramental indwelling of their LORD, needful for nothing more than this, to attain grace to keep the perfection of the Apostolic precept, seemingly so simple:—"Ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered." GOD did not ordain marriage that man might do in it what he would, without sinning. It was not to release him from the conflict with evil, but to aid him in it and shield him against final defeat: and no small portion of the grace of that most holy ordinance, sealed and hallowed as it ever ought to be by the Communion of the Body and Blood of the LORD, may be especially granted to bridegroom and bride, to keep them "undefiled members of CHRIST'S Body." "Let Marriage," says the Apostle, "be honourable in all."

It is not to be wondered at. The married life has dangers from which even celibacy is free. Its purity is as spotless, but often yet more difficult to preserve, because the approaches of evil are more subtly veiled under the garb of innocence. Chastity, if not learnt before marriage, will never be created by it; and though it may be won in and through it, yet not without great suffering: but there cannot be a greater mistake than to conclude that a life of unchastity has been exchanged for one of purity only because a man who, in popular phraseology, has "sown his wild

oats" has taken a wife and "settled down." Chastity is something far more than outward constancy to one woman, even were this, as it is not, the invariable accompaniment of such marriages. If we would have our sons and daughters grow up modest and pure-minded, they must be carefully trained and disciplined from early childhood in habits of self-control, in thought, and word, and deed; no less carefully, and little less severely, than if they were in preparation for a life of celibacy. And in this way again due reverence for Holy Matrimony will become a standing protest and singular safeguard against the soft luxuriousness and self-indulgence of the age and the habits of general self-will which they engender, and which in their turn are the foster-mothers of lawlessness. Discipline and denial of self are less and less tolerated by the world, which loves ease and gratification of mind and body and greedily seeks after every thing which ministers to it. It now almost advocates a life of this embryonic sensuality as right in principle, and honourable in practice.

Against these demoralizing tendencies the Church must set herself with her utmost vigour. Mere "muscular Christianity" will not do: it may interpose partial checks for the time, as it may be that the National Volunteer movement has done: but more is required. These things profit to some extent, but they do not reach the heart of the evil; nothing can do this but bringing it face to face with our LORD's Manhood as the purifying leaven of all humanity. We must oppose to luxury stern Christian self-control, endurance of hardness, encouragement of a manly spirit independent of outward circumstances, and indifferent, if not attached, to discomfort. A simple faithful adherence to the Church's law will do much. The World may talk of the bondage and superstition of Fast and Vigil, Friday and Ember Day, Advent and Lent; but the service of the Church is better than the liberty of the World, which is earthly and tends to corruption and death; while she, with her eye ever fixed on her Incarnate LORD, ever striving to follow His steps and bear her Cross after Him, knows what is the "liberty of the children of GOD." It is worse than folly to decry the celibate life as an outrage on the deepest and most powerful instincts of our common humanity, and yet leave our youth to grow up to maturity and marriage with no vigorous systematic repression of the almost inevitable aberration of those instincts which, owing to our overwrought artificial mode of life, are becoming developed at an abnormally early age, and without training in habits of self-discipline, which are essential to bring all our disordered passions into subjection to the obedience of CHRIST. Habitual tem-

perance must, of course, be enforced in all things; but, beyond this, we shall find frequent need for much, which nothing but watching and prayer and fasting and, in many cases, bodily mortification under wise spiritual counsel will be able to supply.

The spirit and maxims of the World are no safe guides here. The outcry, on moral grounds, against Confession springs too often, we may fear, from a secret consciousness that if sins of this description were brought to that ordeal, there would be only too much to say. It is a subject on which I do not intend to enter, because, at the end of an Essay, it is impossible to discuss it fully; and to say a few words only might be open to misapprehension on one side or the other. But this I know, that to curse the priest in one breath, and bless the physician in the next, is nothing better than ignorance or intolerance; perhaps much worse than either; and that those who are too refined for the faithful preaching or reading of GOD's Word, and whose fastidiousness cannot endure the simple purity of the Marriage Office, are not likely to be good judges of these things. Perhaps if they knew better, and pondered more devoutly on the nature of marriage, they might be more practically anxious lest their children and friends should even unwittingly profane it; remembering that to kneel at the bridal Altar with a body or soul defiled by unrepented sin, even of thought, is sacrilege. For as Holy Matrimony admits us into a sacred brotherhood, graced and glorified by a special nearness to our Incarnate GOD, so does this very nearness intensify our guilt if we pollute it; and this, unless saved as by miracle, we shall surely do if we do not strive and pray to see in it that which is spiritual, not that which is carnal: looking through and beyond the mystery of the earthly Bridal to its beginning far away in the Eternal Mystery of GOD made Man; and to its full interpretation and consummation at the Marriage of the LAMB, in the final Deification of Regenerate Humanity. "For now we see through a glass, in a riddle; but then face to face: now we know in part; but then shall we know even as also we are known." Then, if we are found worthy, shall He satisfy us with Himself by a marvellous fulness; when the Bridegroom, "in Whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," shall take to Himself His Own Bride, and She, too, shall be "filled with all the fulness of GOD;" and CHRIST shall be perfected in the Church, and the Church perfected in CHRIST, and GOD shall be All in all.

JOHN WALTER LEA.

Public Law and the Colonial Church.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RELIGION AND POLICY.

The laws of man are only the rules of his conduct. His conduct consists in the steps which he takes on the road to his end. If I am going to walk from Land's End to York, the places on the road to that city will be the first rule of my conduct on the road, and the foundation of all the other rules of my daily life, till I arrive at the end of my journey. To know the end of a thing, is to know why it was made. And we know why it was made, by finding out how it was made. A rough bit of any thing cannot be ground into rationality or thumped into a passion, or hammered, and filed, and polished into a faculty of knowing and loving. This faculty is the gift of the Great Artificer, and has its seat in the soul. The soul is an invisible substance that cannot be hammered or filed, or crumble into dust, or be divided. Almighty God has made the soul of man immortal, and given it a faculty of knowing and loving. God has made man to know and to love, therefore there must be some object in the knowledge and love of which his happiness consists; and to this object he ought to direct all his steps as the end of his being. Whence, it follows, that the first law of man is his destination to the knowledge of that object in which his happiness consists, and which ought to be his end. And the steps which he takes on the road to this end ought to be the first law of his conduct, and the foundation of all the rest.

To find out what this first law is, we must see for what object it was given. We find from Him who made man, that He alone is both his law and his end. Only God can fill the infinite void of the human heart. To use a fine saying of S. Augustine's:—"Thou, O God, hast made us for Thyself, and my heart is restless till it resteth in Thee." To know Him, He has given man an understanding; and to love Him, He has given him a will. Now the first Commandment which obliges us to love God, obliges us to love our neighbour also. We are all destined to one end, the Beatific Vision of God, which is to

constitute our happiness, and it is said we "all shall be one." But we should never be fit for that end, unless we commence this oneness here by uniting ourselves together by the tie of mutual love, on the road that leads to our destination. It follows that the great, leading, pervading idea of Church organization is UNITY. Small, isolated, voluntary Religious Communities, without a centre of Unity, support, and control, will be sure to lapse, in no long time, into heresy and schism.

Almighty GOD willed the society of mankind to exist by means of two principal ties, the tie of Religion and the tie of the State—the *Polis*. These ties are different in their spirit, in their origin, and in their ministry or jurisdiction; and the two ministries are put into different hands. There are other ties which ought to be mentioned, especially the tie of Humanity; but, owing to the confusion which now exists between the two laws and the two jurisdictions, it seems best to present only the two ties, of Religion and of Policy, in contrast, and in union.

(1.) The spirit of Religion and Policy are different. Religion brings men back to GOD by the light of Divine truth, in order to unite them together, in the keeping of the two great Commandments. It respects the inward man, and infuses those dispositions which are essential to the preservation of the external order of society. The spirit of Policy is to maintain the public peace and the external order of society, and where these good dispositions do not exist, to use force. Here is another point of difference between the spirit of Religion and the spirit of Policy. Peace is good for the State and the order of civil society. But Religion gathers strength from persecution, and is more holy and flourishing in that state than in a state of peace. The seed of the Church was the blood of the Martyrs, who were sacrificed to the fury of their oppressors in the ten several and distinct persecutions, when the Church lay like an egg for the foot of man to crush, when she could not fill her martyrologies with names but only with numbers—with the day of five hundred, or five thousand martyrs, with the martyrdom of a city or the martyrdom of an army. This difference of the effect of peace on Religion and Policy shows the different spirit of the two, and the marks which distinguish them. We judge of Bishops and temporal rulers respectively, by the different views of the ends of Religion and Policy.

(2.) The origin of Religion and Policy is different. An individual joins with himself one man on account of one need, and another for some other need, and thus brings into one dwelling-place helpers and companions, and this assemblage he calls a

Polis, a city. Then as a man cannot spend his time partly in building his house, partly in making his own coat and shoes, or in cooking his own dinner, there must be a division of labour. And as no society can exist without a head and some order of "rank and obedience," there must be a Primate to send every man to his proper place, to do his own proper work—one man can do one thing better than another—and to see that the work is done at the proper time.

"By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread. Even as the green herb have I given thee all things." Almighty GOD has given us all the good things that the earth and the waters produce, but in such a way that we can only obtain a beneficial use by our own labour, and that of others. Therefore He willed the existence of society by means of the ties of marriage between man and woman, and of birth between parents and children, and the different ties of agriculture, commerce, art, and science. The State then is grounded upon Secondary Natural Law, that is, upon human wants and necessities[1]. But the Church is one great, visible, spiritual, and supernatural society, with a supernatural end, and of immediate Divine institution.

(3.) The ministry of the two powers of Religion and Policy is different. The spiritual power instructs and exhorts, binds and looses the inward man. The temporal power commands the outward man, maintains vested rights, and exercises other functions proper to its ministry, such as to chastise the guilty, to inflict pains and penalties, and to punish with banishment and even with death those who violate the order of society and disturb the public peace.

S. Paul condenses the whole moral law into one great Commandment—"Love thy neighbour as thy thyself, for love is the fulfilling of the law;" and lays down the great duty of the obedience of inferiors to superiors, according to the moral law regulating that duty—"Let every soul be subject to the higher powers" (whether spiritual or temporal), "the powers that be are ordained of GOD. Wherefore ye must needs be subject not only for wrath (*i. e.*, for fear of the civil sword), but for conscience sake." This duty, technically called "rank and obedience," or "majority and obedience," is an immutable law of civil society, and of the Church of GOD.

It follows, that these two powers, so different in their spirit, origin, and ministry, have nothing inherent in them to hinder

[1] Primary natural law or Divine natural law respects the existence of attributes of God and the duties we owe unto Him, and is summed up in the Ten Commandments.

their union. The one ought to help the other. If the Church teaches the doctrine of obedience to the civil power, and, as far as its ministry will allow, maintains the order of civil society, it is the duty of the civil society to maintain the order of the Church.

(4.) Because the temporal and spiritual powers are different, GOD has put them into different hands. "And I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My FATHER appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." "As My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you." "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." Our SAVIOUR'S Kingdom then was an empire of truth and justice in the hearts of His faithful subjects, and the obedience and reverence paid to Him as their Judge, Lawgiver, King, and Saviour in His Kingdom on earth, He intended to reward in His Kingdom in Heaven. When our Blessed LORD came to set up His spiritual Kingdom upon earth, it was GOD Manifest in the Flesh. He made known to the world Who and What He was by the splendour of the truths He taught, and the glory of His miracles. Nature His minister gave up her sword into His hand. The winds in the midst of their own roaring heard His voice. Death in putrid and corrupt carcases obeyed His summons; and the grave delivered up the dead to wait upon Him. He trod upon the sea as if it had been marble. But, so essential was it to the order of both jurisdictions (spiritual and temporal) to keep them distinct, though united in Him, that our Divine Master carefully abstained from exercising any function of the civil power. He even refused to be the judge between two brothers. The place of His birth was owing to His obedience to the law of a heathen prince. He satisfied the Roman governor that His Kingdom was not of this world, that it would not interfere with the rights of Cæsar; and He plainly pointed out the difference between His spiritual Kingdom, and the temporal power of the Prince.

CHAPTER II.

RELIGION AND POLICY IN UNION.

MY next step is to exhibit Religion and Policy in union, under the names of the Spiritualty and the Temporalty. Observe, in this point of view the "English Church" of the great constitutional statute, is not considered as a Spiritual body, a Synod,

a branch of the Catholic Church with its own Codex Canonum and its own officers, but, as a part of the Constitution, one of the two estates of the realm, an Establishment (with Ecclesiastical Courts deriving their coercive jurisdiction from the Imperial Crown, and with judicial authority exercised by the Ecclesiastical Judges of the realm), and as a political body governed by Acts of Parliament. As the Spiritualty and the Temporalty represent the two powers or the two jurisdictions of Religion and Policy in union, what I have to consider in this place is this:—When Henry VIII. united these two jurisdictions in his own person, did he confuse them together with the laws spiritual and the laws temporal into one chaotic mass, like the nineteenth century lawyers; or, did he leave them separate as he found them, by putting the same into the different hands of Judges of the Spiritualty and Judges of the Temporalty, only giving an equal protection to both estates of the realm?

Every prerogative of the Crown is derived from statute or prescription; and in either case there must be a legal and established mode of exercising it. Now, no statute, no prescription acknowledges—as vested or inherent in the kingly office—the right of the Crown to judge in the last resort in all ecclesiastical causes, such as the civil affairs of the Spiritualty, much less in those which relate to "the law divine and spiritual learning." By 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19, there is an appeal to the King in the last resort. But why? That by his order ecclesiastical causes should be finally tried and decided *by Ecclesiastical Judges*. The great constitutional statute, 24 Hen. VIII., c. 12, is only declaratory of the old law of the land—of the right of ecclesiastics to judge of temporal matters in causes ecclesiastical. This right has ever been conceded to the Spiritualty, by the princes and nobles of this kingdom, from the time of William the Conqueror down to William IV. Observe, then, that in all non-established Churches, as well as those which are established, "the State" (*i. e.* a judge of the Temporal law) has *no* right to step in and decide ecclesiastical causes whensoever they involve temporal consequences. (Compare this with the Bishop of London's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 42.) And the principle laid down by Lord Lyndhurst in the case of Dr. Warren, with regard to the Methodist community, that spiritual causes should be finally tried and decided by spiritual judges—the tribunal established by the rules of the society—is essential to the very being of every voluntary religious society, in this kingdom and the colonies, from the Roman Catholic Church down to the Ranting Meeting-house.

The Constitutional Law of England knows nothing of "the State," but it recognizes the separate and independent existence and jurisdiction of the two estates, the Spiritualty and the Temporalty. One order has no right over the other. Each is supreme in its own province. Those who exercise the power of the one order are subject to those who exercise the power of the other in all matters relating to it. The Spiritualty does not make Acts of Parliament for the regulation of Commerce, Gaols, and Union Houses, or pass Reform Bills and Turnpike Acts. The Temporalty cannot enact Canons, or define the Real Presence, or mend the Athanasian Creed, or judge heretical Bishops and Priests. What is the design of spiritual censures? To appeal to a man's conscience by bringing before his view the judgment of the Great Day, to produce sorrow and remorse for sin by dread of the Divine displeasure, and to create a desire to be restored to the favour of God. Now, Bracton (107), whom the venerable Bishop of Exeter speaks of (in his *Pastoral Letter*, 1851, p. 3) as the highest ancient authority on our constitutional law, not only declares that the spiritual judge has the sole cognizance of spiritual causes, but with that declaration is given the reason for excluding the temporal Judge:—"There are spiritual causes in which the Judge of the temporal law has no cognizance and no execution, because he has no coercion," that is, because he cannot give effect to his judgment by the coercion of spiritual censures.

The great constitution of Boniface, *Æternæ de pœnis*, Hen. III., A.D. 1261—part of our own domestic canon law which received *two* several and distinct sanctions of Parliament (25 Hen. VIII., c. 19, s. 7[2], and 27 Hen. VIII., c. 15, s. 4)—lays down the two separate and independent jurisdictions, each supreme in its own province, and restrains the clergy from making appeals to the secular Court. "We ordain by authority of this present council, that Archbishops, Bishops, and other prelates (priests in charge) do not come (into the secular Court) when they are called for spiritual matters; since no power is given to laymen to

[2] This statute is quoted in the Queen's Licence, addressed to the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, Wednesday, June 28, 1865 (*vide* the *Guardian*, Wednesday, July 5, 1865). This is to remind Convocation of what it seemed to have forgotten in the matter of the new 29th Canon, to allow persons to stand as sponsors for their own children—the result of Lincolnshire divinity. The licence proves two things, that the old law is not obsolete, as the Privy Council Committee imagine, and that the Spiritualty cannot alter the old law without the consent of the Temporalty—what has received the sanction of two cannot be repealed by the act of one.

judge the Bishops and priests of God but they are under the necessity of obedience. Let the said prelates intimate to the King that they take no cognizance of advowson (*jus patronatus*), chattels, or other such things belonging to his Court, and intend no such thing; but of tythes, sins, and other mere spiritual things belonging to their office and jurisdiction, and to the health of souls." (Lyndwood, p. 314, Oxford, 1679).

Nowhere has the Law of England laid down this doctrine, of the separate and independent existence and jurisdiction of the Spiritualty and the Temporalty, as the voice of the Constitution, more clearly than in the 24 Hen. VIII., c. 12. This is called the Constitutional Statute, but it is only declaratory of the old law of Boniface. The Church and State are not one body politic, governed by King, Lords, and Commons—the Church as a spiritual body exists *beside* the State, *not within* it—but, "this realm of England is an empire governed by one supreme head and king, unto whom a body politic, divided in terms and by names of Spiritualty[3] and Temporalty, have been bounden to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience." Not to quote the Act at length, the power of the King is, "to render and yield justice and final determination in all causes happening to occur within the limits of his realm, without restraint of foreign princes." Next, it asserts that "when any causes of the law Divine happened to come in question or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and showed by that part of the said body politic, called the Spiritualty, now being called the English Church." Again:—"The laws temporal for trial of property, of lands or goods, and for the conservation of the people of the realm in unity, were administered by the other part of the said body politic called the Temporalty; and both their authorities and jurisdictions do conjoin together, in due administration of justice, the one to help the other."

This is the voice of the Constitution, let us hear what it says:—(*a*) This statute by which the two coercive jurisdictions are united in the one person of the King, instead of the Crown having the rule of the Temporalty, and the Pope the control of the Spiritualty—assigned to the spiritual estate, the care of matters spiritual, such as the Holy Trinity and the Blessed Sacraments, as distinctly as to the Temporal estate, the care of matters

[3] "What is the Spiritualty?" (Bishop of S. David's *Charge*, 1866, p. 60.) Judging from the original Constitution of Boniface, from this Act, and from the 139th Canon of 1604, it means the Hierarchy, to whom the government of the Church was committed by Christ.

temporal, such as bridges, sewers, gaols, harbours, and highways. (*b*) The laws ecclesiastical are for the settlement of causes of the law Divine. The laws temporal are for trial of property, of lands and goods. (*c*) The ministry is put into different hands. The laws ecclesiastical are to be administered in Ecclesiastical Courts by ecclesiastical judges; as the laws temporal in the temporal courts by judges of the Temporalty.

As Parliament is the highest temporal Court, so Convocation, as the spiritual estate of the realm, is the highest Ecclesiastical Court, and has or ought to have the control of all inferiors, with the power of proceeding against heretical Bishops and priests, and of re-affirming doctrines impugned. Cases of doctrine *might*, however, come by appeal to the Court of Delegates, by 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19; and it has been held, as to those cases, the Royal Supremacy meant the power of issuing a commission to Bishops —Canonists and Divines—to review the judgment of the Court below, and nothing more. *This keeps the decision of doctrine within the Spiritualty, "now being called the English Church*[4]*."* To give another illustration of this. The Spiritualty asks for *leave* to make Canons, not the *power*. In Canons it is "We decree and ordain," that is the Spiritualty; in Acts it is "Be it enacted by King, Lords, and Commons," that is, the Temporalty —the Bishops in the House of Lords sit as Barons. In the Temporalty the King is the fountain of law; in the Spiritualty, the Episcopate. The Spiritualty makes Canons; the Temporalty, if it sees fit, orders them to be kept.

If space would permit I could note down at full length other illustrations of this great Constitutional Act. There is the Charter of William the Conqueror separating the Court of the Archbishop from the Hundred Court, where the law business of the burgh or hundred was cheaply and expeditiously settled by

[4] "It is difficult to conceive a doubt that the great lawyers, temporal and ecclesiastical, of that age, the very age of the Reformation, concurred in the decision, after grave and repeated consideration, that the only proper tribunal of ultimate appeal in all causes, strictly spiritual, was that of the Provincial Council." (The Bishop of Exeter's *Pastoral Letter*, 1851, p. 6.) Without going back to ancient precedents for the assertion of this sound constitutional and Christian principle—that spiritual causes ought to receive their final decision from spiritual authority—the right of limiting the power of the State in Church matters is clearly recognized in the conditions of the Act of Union with Scotland. Any alteration in the statutes of either of those Churches (of England and Scotland), or in the Liturgy of the Church of England, unless with the consent of the respective Churches collectively or representatively given, would be an infringement of the conditions, and greatly endanger the union.

the joint action of clergy and laymen. The VIIIth Constitution of Clarendon gives appeals to the King in the last resort, that by his order the controversy *in civil causes*[5] might be settled in the Archbishop's Court, and no appeals to Rome without the King's consent.

By the Common and Canon Law the King is a mixed person. *Rex idem hominum Phœbique Sacerdos.* As King and Priest he was expected to employ both ecclesiastical judges and judges of the temporal law in the execution of his kingly office, to keep the Spiritualty and Temporalty to their respective duties—*ut omnes status atque ordines, &c. in* officio contineat—not to *rule* as in the English Article (XXXVII.), and to restrain with the civil sword the evil doers.

The Church and State, then, are *two* distinct bodies. The Spiritualty and Temporalty are the two estates of the "*one* body politic of this realm of England." The question immediately before us is, not like that of the Liberation Society (between the Church and the State), but between the two political estates of the realm. Only Erastians make the Church and State one body. Such a tribunal as the Privy Council Committee cannot destroy or weaken the Church as a Divine institution; but it may imperil its existence as the "Establishment," as the spiritual estate of the realm, because it has, in violation of the constitutional law of England, usurped to the Crown the rights of the Spiritualty, and because it is now wielding a power which, in the view of the Church as the Kingdom of CHRIST, no human legislature can lawfully bestow.

In the "dark ages" when that magnificent shrine, the mother church of this diocese (Lincoln), was built and endowed, together with her beautiful daughters, such as Boston and Louth, temples worthy of GOD's glory, enriched with painting and sculpture; and when Archbishops and Bishops and Chancellors studied the Canon and Civil Law, and legislated on their principles, there was great harmony established between man's citizenship in "the one body politic of this realm of England," and in what is "now being called the English Church." Because both of these have GOD for their founder, and exist by the Divine Will, the legislators of the "dark ages" were careful to keep the spiritual jurisdiction of the realm separate from the temporal. The Prince did not set up judges of the

[5] There was no thought of appealing to the King in matters of faith. The clergy were not to go out of the realm for any *civil cause*. Pusey's *Royal Supremacy*, p. 199.

temporal law as judges of the spiritual law who could not tell the difference between order and jurisdiction[6]. The ancient lawgivers made religion and policy support each other, so that the citizens of the Church and the State were able to pay a strict and dutiful obedience to both laws—both the law of "this Church" and the "law of this realm"—both the *Jus Canonicum* and the *Jus Regium*—both the Word of God and Acts of Parliament; and Alfred's statutes were prefaced by the Decalogue. By placing religion, morals, politics, and laws upon the basis of Christianity, they endeavoured to make the empire reflect the image of the Kingdom of Christ. If it be said that by any "arrangement in accordance with the principle laid down at the Reformation," (*vide* the Bishop of London's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 44)—not one jot or tittle of any act of the Spiritualty or of the Temporalty is given in proof the principle—if it be said that the citizens of the Church and the State are *now* directed to pay strict and dutiful obedience to both laws, whilst adultery is legalized by Act of Parliament, and the Bible lawfully denied to be the Word of God, and one of the two great Sacraments impugned, under the sanction of the Privy Council Committee, I beg leave respectfully to deny it *in toto*. "I know of no evidence that there never was a time when practically the decision of such appeals was" *not* "in the hands of ecclesiastics alone, without the aid of laymen," before the 37th Hen. VIII., c. 17. (*Vide* the Bishop of London's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 44.) In no Christian country, throughout the whole world, was the judicial authority of the Church ever delegated to a layman *at all*, except in Church matters purely *civil*, before this statute. And this layman, appointed by the Bishop or Archbishop, was the mere instrument by which the ecclesiastical judge exercised his office.

I conclude that the Crown cannot interfere with doctrine except through the Spiritual estate of the realm, that is *through the Church itself*. "The State," (that is, a Judge of the temporal law) "has" *no* "right to step in and decide cases of doctrine whensoever they involve temporal consequences[7]." For a judge of the Temporalty to override the decision of the Archbishop or his Chancellor, the highest judge of the Spiritualty, in "any cause of the law Divine or of Spiritual learning,"

[6] *Vide* the Lord Chancellor's Law, Final Court of Appeal.—*Church and State Review*, Jan. 2, 1865: and the Master of the Rolls' Law.—*John Bull*, Nov. 17, 1866.

[7] *Vide* Bishop of London's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 42.

is a direct, overt, palpable violation of the great Constitutional Statute. "The State," (that is, a judge of the Temporalty) cannot, without tyranny and persecution, decide matters of conscience in opposition to the Spiritualty, to whom the decision of such matters properly belongs—by the charter of William the Conqueror, by the great constitution of Boniface, and by the great Constitutional Statute, the 24 Hen. VIII., c. 12. If, only for the sake of argument, I admit that the final decision of cases of *doctrine* has been in the hands of laymen, "from the Reformation down to this time." (*Vide* the Bishop of London's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 44.) Then the length of time during which this "practice" has continued, is only an aggravation of the injustice, and calls the more loudly for ample, immediate, and decisive redress.

"The result of transferring the jurisdiction of the Privy Council to the Judicial Committee was, in point of fact, *to remove from the Church* the ultimate decision of all matters connected even with the very doctrines of the Church. . . . He was quite certain that this was a matter which, at the time, must have been overlooked—he was quite sure that it was a *casus omissus*." (Bishop of Exeter's Speech in the House of Lords, Friday, March 8, 1844.) "A Roman Catholic or a Protestant Dissenter may take part in deciding what is, and what is not, the doctrine of the Church. The anomaly of this state of things is apparent. And it should in fairness be stated that the framers of the Act under which the present Court of Appeal was created, did not contemplate the reference of *cases of doctrine* to it." (*Vide* Bishop Kaye's last *Charge*, 1852; with which compare the Bishop of London's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 44.) "That ecclesiastical causes should be tried and decided by ecclesiastical judges, has been the law of the Church from the beginning. . . . Its maintenance is essential to the independence and religious liberties of those voluntary religious associations which exist in the colonies, and has never been surrendered by them." (Bishop of Capetown's *Charge*, 1864, p. 10.)

To make an end of this chapter. The doctrine clearly and distinctly laid down in the noble and majestic language of the great Constitutional Statute, of the separate and independent jurisdiction of the spiritual and temporal powers, is a fundamental principle of Universal Public Law, by which mankind is governed, and contains the only solution of the question of the relations between Church and State, at home, in the Colonies, and throughout the world.

CHAPTER III.

RELIGION ANTECEDENT TO POLICY.

"LOCKE, in a letter concerning Toleration, gives this definition:—A Church is a voluntary society of men joining themselves together of their own accord, in order to the public worship of GOD, in such a manner as they judge acceptable to Him, and effectual to the salvation of their souls. Religion is antecedent to civil societies, and has nothing at all to do with their establishments." (Puffendorf, p. 666, fol. ed., 1729.) If our Blessed SAVIOUR set up an Universal Church, there must be an Universal Ecclesiastical Law. And this body of law must be altogether independent of, and perfectly distinct from all municipal law, i.e. the law of the land, whether public (belonging to all the people of the land), or private (respecting particular towns, corporations, schools, and colleges); and this ecclesiastical law must be administered by ecclesiastical judges, as laid down in the last chapter of this Essay. The principle is this: Church law must be administered by Church judges, whether it be the "Church" of John Wesley, or of George Brown, or of John Fox, or the Church built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, and for this reason—If a man were obliged to follow the religion of the Prince, or Parliament, or of the Privy Council Committee, or of the Local Legislature, he must change his religion as often as there is a new decision in some final Court of Appeal, and he must, in twenty or thirty years, be of many different religions in order to be saved. Whence it follows that the Church in South Africa, as a Synod, and a voluntary society, is supreme in her own province, and owes her first obedience to the Public Universal Law of the Church Catholic. But the Church at home is both a Synod of the Church Catholic, and also the spiritual estate of the realm—an Establishment. As a synod it is subject to the whole Body of CHRIST, as an estate of the realm it is subject to the Imperial Crown. It follows that the Church at home is under two laws: the Public Universal Law of "this Church," and also the King's Ecclesiastical Law—"the law of this Realm." The study of the ancient Canon and Civil Law enabled the ancient lawgivers to reconcile these two laws, and to bring the two ties of religion and policy into harmonious combination, so that the citizens were able to pay a strict and dutiful obedience to both. Why is Christianity

part and parcel of the law of the land? and why do the Bishops sit in Parliament? The use of Bishops in Parliament is "to prevent, in the framing of laws, any departure from the principles of Christianity." (Bishop Kaye's *Charge*, 1849.) If the legislature is to be secularized, and we are to have two conflicting laws—one law of "this Church" and another "law of this Realm"—if the Gospel is to be interpreted to mean the same as Mahometanism, if no man can ever be in the wrong, or ever be in the right, and the law of the land is no longer to be founded on the law of CHRIST, whilst Alfred wished to render Christianity the law itself, the Bishops have no place in Parliament, their occupation is gone.

If the Church were a body within the State, like a corporation, or University, or the army, or the navy, the State would have as absolute power over the one as the other, but the "English Church" is of Divine institution, antecedent to the civil society, and it is not possible for the citizens to live in obedience to both laws, both the "law of this Church" and the "law of this Realm," unless the ecclesiastical law be as universal as the Church itself, unless the law of the Church and of the "Establishment," of the *Jus Canonicum* and of the *Jus Regium*, both of them, be founded on Public Universal Ecclesiastical Law, to be administered by ecclesiastical judges—Canonists and Divines. The Bishop of S. David's complains, not without reason, of "the schools and parties into which the Church is parcelled." (*Vide* the Bishop's last *Charge*, 1866, p. 59.) How is this? Because the Ecclesiastical Judges, from the court of the Archdeacon to the Privy Council Committee, know little of the ecclesiastical law of the Universal Church, and absolutely nothing of the theology of the Universal Church. It is true that these are two distinct sciences. Law deals with outward acts and a visible society, and theology respects the inward motions of the soul; still the one is a great help to the other [8].

Locke's definition is quoted with approbation by Barbeyrac; but it only says what a voluntary society is: I will endeavour to explain what it is not, by contrasting it with the "Establishment." A voluntary society has no legal *status*. Take for

[8] "After the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had decided that Dr. Colenso could not legally be deposed, because he had never been properly appointed a Bishop, the Master of the Rolls has held that the Trustees are bound to pay him his salary, because he was appointed a Bishop of Natal. The Church of South Africa suffers from the uncertainty that seems to prevail in all branches of our Ecclesiastical Law."—*John Bull*, Dec. 29, 1866.

example a Grammar School. Its laws are private law, contained in the deed of the founder, not in Acts of Parliament, they do not belong to public municipal law. They oblige the trustees and the schoolmaster. The trustees can dismiss the schoolmaster for neglect of duty, and he can appeal to the Court of Chancery for protection, like any other citizen, but he has no legal *status* like the Parson of the parish.

A voluntary society has no coercive jurisdiction. It has only that which is enforced by spiritual censures and by excommunication, and is binding on the consciences of the members of the society in matters spiritual. So far the Church had jurisdiction during the ten several and distinct persecutions in the primitive times. The Church of Capetown has received from the Crown no external tribunals, such as the Courts of the Bishops in England, where she can administer justice in matters purely spiritual, as well as in the civil affairs of the Church, with the power of compelling to obedience those who have no regard to spiritual censures. This last jurisdiction the State gives, and the state can take away. She has only that spiritual jurisdiction of binding and loosing, the grant of our Blessed Lord to the Apostles and their successors, and this the State can neither destroy nor weaken.

Again, a voluntary society is not subject to *Jus Regium Ecclesiasticum*. It has only the power of the keys. It can only bring men to repentance by Church censures, by the dread of exclusion from the Church on earth, the door and entrance into the Church in Heaven. The Dean of Capetown cannot bring an incestuous person before the Chancellor of the diocese, the living voice of *Jus Regium Ecclesiasticum*, to have him punished according to the law of the Provinciale, and of the *Jus Pontificium*, and of the Reformation Acts of Hen. VIII., and of modern Acts of Parliament[9]. The society has only the power of inflicting spiritual exile. Excommunication in the primitive times had this temporal effect—if a layman, it excluded the members of the Church from having any dealings with him, if a clerical offender, it deprived him of his share of the offertory made for the maintenance of the priesthood.

Again, a voluntary society is not subject to the Royal Supremacy, because it is not subject to *Jus Regium Ecclesiasticum*. This law belongs to the spiritual estate of the realm and to the

[9] I have quoted the whole of the *Jus Regium*. A proceeding may be under the general Ecclesiastical Law, or under a particular statute which deals only with the Prayer Book and XXXIX Articles.

ecclesiastical courts, and is enforced by the Royal Supremacy; but the Church of Capetown is no part of the spiritual estate of the realm like the Church of Canterbury, and no part of the Constitution of England. Again, the XXXVIIth Article applies to the Bishop of Capetown as much as to the Bishop of Rome. "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England, and other her dominions," that is, no jurisdiction that can be enforced by the laws of the realm. This is exactly the position of the Bishop of Capetown. Therefore, the Church of Capetown is not subject to the Royal Supremacy[1].

The Church in South Africa, then, has no legal *status*, does not belong to the spiritual estate of the realm of England, is no part of the Constitution, has no *Jus Regium Ecclesiasticum*, no Ecclesiastical Courts with coactive, coercive jurisdiction derived from the Imperial Crown, and is not subject to the Royal Supremacy, with the blessings of a final appeal from the Court of Arches to the Court of the Privy Council Committee. Whence it follows that the Church in South Africa is as much a voluntary religious society as the "Church" of John Wesley, or George Brown, or John Fox.

CHAPTER IV.

THE USE OF THE TEMPORAL POWER ILLUSTRATED OUT OF THE CIVIL LAW.

As the outward actions of man have a relation to the public order of society, every violation of contract involving religious duty

[1] For the Trustees of the "Colonial Bishopric Fund" to deal with the *Church in South Africa* as a voluntary society, "was to elevate the Church over the Throne, or to depose the Sovereign from being the head of the *Church of England* in the colonies dependent on her." (The Rolls' Judgment, p. 1147 of the *Guardian*, Nov. 7, 1866.) Now, that a voluntary society in South Africa is part of the Established Church of England, and subject to the Queen as the head of the Church, is absolute nonsense. *And the title is illegal.* The King was constituted Supreme Head of the Church by 26 Hen. VIII., c. 1. 4, A.D. 1534. This Act was repealed by Mary, and was not revived by Elizabeth. By 24 Hen. VIII., c. 12, "the King is the head of the two estates of the one body politic of this realm of England, divided in terms and by names of spiritualty and temporalty." The Church is antecedent to the State, and no part of the Establishment. The Queen is the head of a political society called the "Establishment;" but her Majesty is *in* the Church of Christ, and *not over* it.

which brings religion in contact with policy so as to disturb the public order, is restrained by the temporal power, and punishment is inflicted as the facts of the case deserve, according to circumstances. Take any voluntary religious society, and for the sake of convenience call it "the Church." Those contracts which produce a right of action are grounded on a cause or consideration: for instance, if A. give B. the oversight of the church of C. with the temporalities belonging to the office, in consideration of B. engaging to yield obedience to A. his superior, according to law regulating that obedience[2]. Now a sincere belief in the faith of "the Church" implies the duty, on the part of the minister of making a public profession of his faith, and of teaching and publishing nothing that is contrary to it. He must obey his superior according to the law of "the Church" regulating his obedience. And to disobey is a violation of contract. The mode of dealing with such a case according to the Roman Civil Law seems to be this—The temporal power does not set itself up as a judge of doctrine, an office which belongs to the Church and her ministers; but, if not satisfied of the authority of the judges and of the regularity of their proceedings, appoints other ministers of "the Church" to review the judgment. If clerks be summoned before their own Bishops, and the litigants stand to the Bishops' order, the civil judge is to put it into execution; but if not, then the civil judge is to examine it, to confirm or annul the Bishops' order. If he confirm it, the order is to stand; if not, then the person aggrieved may appeal. (Cap. xxi. Novel. 123). Bishops are to be summoned before the Metropolitan with two other Bishops (*Gloss.* with other Bishops) of the same Synod. There is a final appeal to the Patriarch. (Cap. xxii. Novel. 123).

Religion and Policy are not rivals, to whom elements of power must be carefully meted out, lest one should devour the other, but the two ties by which Almighty God willed the existence of the society of mankind. The Emperor makes the glory of God the beginning, middle, and end of policy. (Novel. 109 in *præfat.*) The constitution of Theodosius the younger, incorporated into the code of Justinian (Lib. i. Tit. ii. const. 6) is as follows:—"Let there be no innovations: we command that

[2] For the Canonical oath of obedience to the Archbishop, known to all Christendom, and considered up to this time as amply sufficient for all Churches, *vide* the Consecration of Bishops in the Book of Common Prayer. Our Saviour gave the keys to a body united to a head. It follows that there is no authority for a collection or a committee of autocephalous Bishops, owing no obedience to a Metropolitan but only to a Synod, as in Scotland.

the ancient ecclesiastical canons be kept through the province of Illyricum; and if any matter of dispute should arise, let it be reserved *conventui sacerdotali sanctoque judicio.*" "But if the offence be ecclesiastical, and needing ecclesiastical punishment, let the Bishop take cognizance thereof, to the exclusion of the most illustrious rulers of the province (*exclusis clarissimis provinciæ præsidibus*). For we wish civil judges not even to notice such causes, because such matters ought to be examined ecclesiastically, and the souls of sinners healed by ecclesiastical punishments, and the sacred and divine canons which even our laws do not disdain to follow." (Cap. i. Novel. 83.) The Emperor here lays down a fundamental principle of Public Universal Law, ignored by the nineteenth century lawyers, namely this—Those laws are to be held temporal, and have their construction from temporal lawyers, which are made and promulgated about temporal rights and causes. And such laws, rules, and regulations as are set out and published by "the Church" upon Church matters, shall be taken and accounted ecclesiastical, and be interpreted by Church judges. The Emperor says both Church and State have their origin in the Divine Will. "The greatest gifts of GOD to man are the Priesthood and the Imperial Power, the one ministering in things Divine, the other presiding over things temporal, both proceeding from one and the same origin." (Novel. 6. *præfat.*) "In all things we have maintained the state of union of the most holy Churches with the most holy Pope and Patriarch of old Rome, to whom we have written to this effect. For we do not suffer, that any of those things which belong to the ecclesiastical *status*, should not be referred to his Blessedness also, since he is the Head of all the most holy priests of GOD, and because, as often as heretics have arisen in these parts, they have been restrained by the sentence and right judgment of that venerable seat." (Cod. Lib. i. Tit. i. 7.) "The four general Councils are to be held as law, and what is decreed in them" (that is, the 207 Canons). The Bishop of Rome has the first place in all assemblies, and then the Bishop of Constantinople. (Cap. i. Novel. 131, and cap. ii. and the 166 Canon.) The appeal is from the Exarch (or Primate) to the Patriarch. (Canon 195 and 187 of the Codex.)

The laws of the Emperor afford the most generous assistance to the Church and her authority, and at the same time they acknowledge the spiritual jurisdiction of a ministerial and executive head of the one great, visible, spiritual and supernatural society, with a supernatural end, as necessary to preserve the state of union of the most holy Churches.

CHAPTER V.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE LEADING PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

I HAVE shown the difference between Religion and Policy, and how the first Christian Emperors dealt with the Church when it came in contact with the State; and the principles laid down are applicable to any voluntary religious society. What follows is some account of the doctrine of Unity and Universality, of Majority and Obedience, of the Primacy of the Church and the Supremacy of the State, and of the power of governing the Church.

"What is thy duty to thy neighbour? My duty to my neighbour is to love him as myself, and to do unto all men as I would they should do unto me. To honour and obey the Queen and all that are put in authority under her. To submit myself to all my governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters. To order myself lowly and reverently to all my betters." Under this beautiful summary of social duties is contained the pith of the two great, leading, pervading principles of the Canon Law—(1) "Unity and Universality," and (2) "Majority and Obedience." Let us see how this is (*a*) "That they *all* may be *one*; as Thou, FATHER, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be One in Us." How can this be, except men begin by loving one another here upon earth? And how can a man love himself better than by steering such a course of unity here, as may lead to the immortal possession of GOD in Heaven? Thus the first law which obliges to love GOD, implies the second which obliges to Unity. (*b*) To honour and obey the Queen, &c. Here the Church inculcates that order of society by which an inferior is made subject to a superior, not absolutely but according to law, and this is by the Canonists technically called "Majority and Obedience." There are different sources of Majority—(*a*) the prerogative of order, by which a Bishop is superior to a priest; (*b*) the prerogative of power or jurisdiction, whereby an Archbishop is above a Bishop, though both are equal in point of order; and (*c*) the prerogative of age.

From Majority comes Obedience. In the Provinciale (Lib. i. Tit. xiv.), obedience consists in three things—(*a*) in showing reverence to a superior, (*b*) in receiving his commands, and (*c*) in submitting to his judgment. An inferior is bound to give

his superior the best place, sitting or standing, and to obey his lawful commands. But an inferior is not bound to submit to a superior unless he has jurisdiction over him—*nisi sit ejus subditus*. To apply this: In the State we know that the sovereignty is in the Queen, but where is the sovereignty in the one great, visible society, the Holy Catholic Church? Who is the great spiritual pastor and master to whom our first obedience is due in the one great supernatural society with a supernatural end? Take the Greek Church with its hundred millions, and the Latin Church with its three hundred millions. Two heads to one body make a monster. Two heads and two bodies are directly opposed to the Unity, and the very essence of CHRIST's Church, and to His design of preventing schism—the setting up Altar against Altar. How can we have legitimate mission with more than one ecclesiastical Superior? The Archbishop gives mission to the Bishop, the Bishop to the Priest by institution or licence. The Crown does not give mission, nor does Parliament, nor does the patron. *Nemo dat quod non habet.* With two or three heads, that is, two or three primary sources of mission—Canterbury, Rome, Constantinople—there may be two or three heads in every see of Christendom. This is the best way of turning the one Kingdom of CHRIST into a Babel, or the Body of CHRIST into a monster. The Apostles committed the power of the keys to the whole Episcopate united to *one* ministerial head. The Primacy in one and the same body is indivisible. Owing to the sad divisions of Christendom, the great leading doctrines of Public Universal Ecclesiastical Law, on which the unity of the Church is founded, are inapplicable, or rather are in abeyance. If we go by reason and analogy, as our first obedience is due to the Queen, and then to those whom she has put in authority over us, so our first obedience is due to the Primate of Christendom, and then to our own Bishop. Again, our chief obedience is due to the Primate of Christendom, with his Œcumenical Parliament of Bishops; and next to the see of Canterbury with its Provincial Synod.

"The powers that be" are not only ordained, but subordinated. In every society there must be a highest power, that is, a sovereign (1 S. Pet. ii. 13, 14). Other authorities are *sent* by him. There must be one primary source of legitimate mission. This authority is the Primacy (*Primatus*) of the Church, and the Supremacy (*Summatus*) of the State[3]. It is equally competent

[3] The Royal Supremacy and the Papal Supremacy are merely temporal sovereignties. We ought not to speak of the "Papal Supremacy," when we are only thinking of the Pope as a great Spiritual Ruler.

for the Crown to give legitimate mission to a Bishop, as to send the angel Gabriel on an embassy to the court of Turkey. Church matters are in danger of coming to a dead lock for want of the one primary source of mission [4].

The Church is a perfect body. Suarez lays down (Lib. iii. cap. i. (3)) the important distinction between a perfect and imperfect body. The imperfect is the family. The perfect is the body politic. A family of itself is insufficient, and therefore of necessity a body politic is required, consisting of many families: no single family has within itself all the arts and necessaries of human life, much less is it able of itself to procure the necessary knowledge of all things. (4) The second principle is this. In a perfect body there must be of necessity the power of governing the community. Nature is not deficient in necessary things; therefore as a perfect body is agreeable to reason and natural law, so also is the power of governing it, without which there would be the utmost confusion. (6) The chief magistrate, if supreme in his own order, has the power of making civil laws. Because the civil magistrate is necessary to govern the commonwealth, and one of his most necessary duties is the making of laws, therefore this power is inherent in the civil magistrate. For whosoever receives an office receives all necessary powers for the exercise of the same.

Now, is the Church a perfect body, perfect in itself, with functions analogous to other bodies politic? Is it supreme in its own province? Can it do its own work, make its own laws, appoint its own officers, and raise its own taxes, tithes, and offerings? Or, is it an imperfect body, a corporation within the state? Is it like any municipal body such as a College, or University? Has the state absolute power over it? And does the state make laws of the Church as well as laws civil?

Suarez proves at great length (Lib. iv. cap. ii. (2)) that the Church had always full and perfect power of legislation; it belongs to the law of grace, and was the gift of Christ. It is a visible body and governed by a visible power (cap. i. (5)). In this chapter he proves from tradition, custom, and Councils—(*a*) The Church is one mystical Body of Christ, as we gather from the Fathers and the Creeds. (*b*) It is a Divine institution, constituted perfectly and in order (Rom. x. 13, *Quæ a Deo sunt ordinata sunt*). Now the Church would not be constituted perfectly and in order, if it had not an adequate power of ruling and

[4] For want of space I am obliged to leave out the hierarchy of order and jurisdisdiction, and the five acts necessary for the creation of a Bishop. (1) Designation, (2) Mission, (3) Election, (4) Confirmation, and (5) Consecration.

governing the community, like any other body politic. It would be a body without a head, a multitude without order; and the result would be only confusion. (*c*) There is therefore in the Church a spiritual sovereignty to which belongs the government of the Church in spirituals. Therefore there is also in that sovereignty the power of making rules (*potestas præcipiendi*). And there can be no sovereign without the power of making rules, because all government is useless without the necessity of obedience. (6) The power of the Church is really and truly legislative. (9) The Jewish Church was confined to one nation. The Christian Church is spread throughout the whole world, and CHRIST has committed the government of the same to His ministers.

Jurisdiction, as to origin and power, is in the body; as to use, in the head. In the 16th chapter of S. Matthew, our Divine LORD gives the power of the keys to S. Peter in the future tense, and in the 18th chapter to the whole Twelve in act and deed. It follows that the power of the keys was given to the whole body united to one ministerial or executive head. There are now three ministerial heads in one society, and three primary sources of Unity. The Episcopate slept in the Apostolate. It was the last branch to grow out of the Apostolic stem, but is clearly seen in the Revelation of S. John. Bellarmine urges that the power of the keys was given to S. Peter, *individue*. So it was in the creation of the Church, but not to S. Peter's successor in the propagation and extension of the Church in post-Apostolic times. The Apostles did not delegate the power of the keys to their successors *individue*, this would have been little better than the delegation of dead men—*Delegatus non potest delegare*—and the power would have ceased with the Apostolate. They left all power of governing the Church to the Episcopate *collective*, as to a corporation that never dies. In the next place it is impossible for any given number of Bishops, or trustees, or town-councilmen, or fellows of college to exercise jurisdiction. It follows from these premises that they must appoint a head. The power of the head flows from the body, and the head is accountable to the collective Episcopate. The Pope is worse off than any one, if he has no one to call him to account. The keys, then, were given to the body united to a head. This general principle was laid down by CHRIST Himself. The laws of Patriarchs, Exarchs, Primates, and Metropolitans, are only particular human determinations of the Law of CHRIST, just as human laws are particular determinations of the Law Natural. The Law of Nature says:—"Hurt nobody in word or deed;" but

if I set my neighbour's house on fire because I want to roast my eggs, the judge must lay the damages.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLONIAL CHURCH.

WHY do we use this title?—"The Church in South Africa;" or, "The South African Church?" Churches are called African, Anglican, Gallican, and Italian, in regard to divisions political, temporal, natural, and the like, which originate Patriarchates, Exarchates, provinces, dioceses, and parishes. To quote from the debates in the Upper House of Convocation, 29th June, 1866 (*Ecclesiastical Gazette*, p. 110, 11 Sept., 1866): "*The Bishop of Oxford*—There is no reason why the Colonial Bishops should resign their endowments. *The Bishop of London*—They are for the Church of England. *The Bishop of Oxford*—For the Church in Africa, in union with the Church of England." All honour to the Bishop of Oxford, for his eloquent outspoken defence of the Church in South Africa, and of its noble Metropolitan. Let the Colonial Church trust such able men as the Bishop of Capetown, the Bishop of Grahamstown, and the Bishop of Newcastle, and settle all their business in Australia, without sending to the antipodes.

Why is it right to use the title "Bishop of Pietermaritzburg?" A Bishop has a certain definite local compass given him by mission—either legitimate or illegitimate, as it may happen—for the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction, in order that he may build on his own foundation, and to distinguish one bishopric from another. But he has no territory assigned him, as if a bishopric were a temporal sovereignty. It was reserved for the nineteenth century lawyers to make a "Bishop of the territory of Natal." This is unknown to Law, and without parallel in the history of the world. A Bishop takes his title not from the territory, but from the *see*, the *seat*, where the Bishop is *set*, and the *souls* belonging to the same. I have read about a king of East Anglia, but I never heard of a Bishop of Norfolk and Suffolk[5].

[5] It is enough to provoke a smile to read in *The Churchman's Almanack for* 1867—"W. G. Tozer, D.D., Bishop of Central Africa; E. Twells, D.D., Bishop of the Orange River Territory; and S. Crowther, D,D., Bishop of the Niger Territory." It looks as if the Crown claimed, under letters patent, an universal temporal sovereignty, and as if the three Bishops were three Feudal Barons, holding in fee of their suzerain the Crown.

What is a territorial Church? A mere national or territorial Church is a Church existing *in* the state, bounded by it, and subject to the national direction. It follows the religion of Parliament, or of Public Opinion, or of the Prince. It may be Calvinistic, Arminian, Lutheran, or any thing else, according to the tide of fashion. *Cujus est regio, illius est religio.* A collection of National Churches—mere establishments—is not the Catholic Church, but simply a collection of civil states, or political societies confined within certain limits, and bounded by the temporal sovereignty. Their principles are individuality, separate existence, and independence. The Catholic Church is one, and comprehends all those that hold the Catholic faith—in France, Spain, Africa, England—in all the countries of the world. The Catholic Church in its first aspect is considered as one society—One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church—altogether apart from divisions political, temporal, and natural.

The Colonial Church as a member of the Church Catholic.—Religion is antecedent to civil society. Our Blessed LORD created the Church a perfect body, perfect in itself, and competent to do its own work. He did not send the Church into the world as an infant to spell out GOD and CHRIST in the books of Nature and of Grace, till at last, under the care and tuition of civil society, it grew up to the power, and the understanding, and stature of a man. The Church is not only perfect as a whole body, but perfect in every member of the body. Like the soul in the body, it is *tota in toto et tota in qualibet parte.* We must look at the Colonial Churches as one society, as one member of the Church Catholic, and yet perfect in itself, existing beside the State (not in union with it, as if it were part of the Constitution), and subject (not to the Royal Supremacy or Parliament, but) to Public Universal Ecclesiastical Law.

I desire to see the Church of Capetown, Grahamstown, Pietermaritzburg, Sidney, Newcastle, Goulburn—all the free, un-established Churches, as one society reaching out to some one central point of support, control, and unity, in Australia; with a hierarchy competent to settle all ordinary business at home, but with no appeal out of Australia except to a general Council of the whole English Church. This combines unity with universality, the very first principle of Public Universal Ecclesiastical Law. I have shown that all power of governing the Church is lodged in the body of the Episcopate. Let the Colonial Bishops and Metropolitans, sent adrift by the notorious decision of Lord Westbury, meet in general Council, and appoint a Primate, for him, with the assistance of a council of Metropolitans and

Bishops, to organize the Colonial Churches into one perfect body. I wish to see a native Church with a native ministry; and, as no kingdom can exist without taxes, it must have a revenue of its own—the Divine revenue of tithes and offerings. I hope to see, not the Church of England in South Africa, like the Church of England in Ireland, which is a manifest failure, but the Church in South Africa, New Zealand, Tasmania—in all the cities of Australia united into one perfect body holding the Catholic Faith.

There is a great disputation amongst the learned concerning the ancient dignity and power of Primates. (Devotus, vol. i. p. 182, xxxviii.) I need not enter into this dispute. I assume that only an Œcumenical Council can appoint a Patriarch, and that the chief difference between a Patriarch and a Primate consists in the extent of his jurisdiction. A Primate is set over one nation, and a Patriarch over more than one. Then a Primate stands in the same relation to a Metropolitan as this to his suffragan Bishop. The Metropolitan consecrates the Bishops of the province, receives appeals from them, decides questions of the law divine, and summons provincial synods of Bishops. The Primate gives legitimate mission, consecrates the Metropolitans, and summons national councils of Metropolitans and Bishops. From the Primate the only appeal is to an Œcumenical Council, —if it can be had; if not, to a general Council of the whole English Church. Diocesan synods are the native councils of the Bishops. Here we have synodal action with appellate jurisdiction, not *Ecclesia in Episcopo*. The keys were given to the body rather than to the head. This I confidently assert, and without fear of contradiction, that for strength and elasticity, the hierarchy of Jurisdiction, according to the "ancient Canons," as a form of Polity, is without parallel in the history of the world.

The 207 Canons as the standard of appeal for the Colonial Church.—It is quite out of my power to lay down any mutual standard of appeal as the bond of union between established and unestablished Churches, so as to form them into one body politic, at once durable and elastic. The established Churches are obliged to receive as their mutual standard of appeal—(1) The "Ancient and Common Law" of the Church Universal, *i. e.*, the 207 Canons, so well suited to the wants of the Colonial Church; (2) a great part of the *Jus Pontificium* received here in England as "Common Law," on the ground of custom and usage; (3) the Provinciale, *i. e.*, the constitutions of our own Bishops in Provincial Synods and National Councils during the middle-age period

up to the Reformation. This law is the *Jus Canonicum*, the "law of this Church," and by the great Ecclesiastical Statutes of Hen. VIII. converted into *Jus Regium*, the "Law of this Realm[6]." (4) Our Post-Reformation Canons, which, so far as they are declaratory of the old *Jus Canonicum*, are binding on all the citizens, laity as well as clergy; (5) penal statutes of Elizabeth, which deal only with the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles, and modern Acts of Parliament. All this is the general Ecclesiastical Law of "this Realm." Taking the Colonial Church as one member of a corporate body, she is in the position of a member obliged to provide for herself under circumstances of great difficulty, without the consent of, yet not against the law of the whole body. This is to be done by accepting such a mutual standard of appeal as the Ancient and Common Law of the Church Catholic, the 207 Canons of the "*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ a Justiniano Imperatore confirmatus.*" This is law for the whole Church, East, and West, and Anglican. There are great leading principles necessary for the constitution and government of the Colonial Church laid down in the general ecclesiastical law of this realm, and well worthy of our careful study; but as a *Codex Canonum* it is altogether inapplicable to the wants of the Church in the Colonies. Some of the titles are out of use, and some are retained in the general. But whatever those laws are that are "applicable to the circumstances of the country in which the Church sojourns," it is for the Church itself to determine, because the State, that is the civil judge, cannot, without tyranny and persecution, decide upon matters of conscience in opposition to the Church.

"*How shall a society which is national as well as Catholic, be at one with a society which is Catholic without being national*[7]*?*" According to the 139th Canon of 1604, "Convocation is the Church of England by representation." It is both the spiritual estate of the realm, and also a Synod of the Holy Catholic Church. Let us for a moment put out of sight the spiritual

Jus Regium. *Jus Canonicum.*

[6] 1 Eliz. c. i. 5, 36, recognizes the first four or any other General Council.
25 Hen. VIII. c. 21, recognizes the *Jus Pontificium*.
25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, recognizes the National Canon Law.
27 Hen. VIII. c. 15, recognizes the National Canon Law again.
And this is the answer to the question of the Bishop of Grahamstown, "What are the laws of the Church of England, as distinguished from the laws of the Establishment in England?" (*Colonial Church Chronicle*, Aug. 1, 1866, p. 325.)

[7] This question was put by the Dean of Capetown at the York Congress.

estate of the realm, and look only at the Synod. The bond of union between the Synod of Canterbury and the Synod of Capetown, consists in the mutual acceptance, if not of the general ecclesiastical "law of this Realm," at least of the ancient and common law of the Church Universal, which all Catholics are bound to respect, and we must look upon the Provinciale as the by-laws of a particular Church. The Church of England cannot repudiate the ancient and common law without imperilling her own catholicity. The Ancient and Common Law comprehends—(1) the knowledge of the existence and attributes of God, the Creation, the Fall, the Sacraments to recover man from the Fall; (2) the law of faith and morals; (3) the authority of the Catholic Church, and the laws established by the Apostles and their successors as the Polity of the Church. All this law is immediately grounded upon the Ten Commandments, the Four Gospels, the doctrines of the Apostolic writers, the Books of the Old and New Testament, and the Œcumenical Councils. The acceptance of this law does not prevent the Synod of Capetown from making by-laws, as the Mother Church has done before her. Looking at the Church in South Africa as a part of the Church Catholic, it is manifest that one part of a body politic cannot subvert the public law of the whole. A corporation cannot make by-laws subversive of the municipal law of the land. So any particular Church can make rules and canons to meet its own necessities, provided only they are not subversive of the common law of the Church Catholic received and accepted by both the mother and her daughter. Neither the Synod of Capetown nor of Canterbury can introduce any new matter for Ecclesiastical Law[8]. It can only pass declaratories, and not revocatories of the old law. There is no supreme judge, no Ecclesiastical Superior, to revise or cancel its decisions, no competent authority to say whether the new matter is in harmony with the whole Divine law in all its branches, with the whole Catholic faith. Now no one can be a judge of this unity and universality except a body representing the unity and universality of the faith itself, that is, an Œcumenical Council.

Of Public and Private Law, and of the Thirty-nine Articles as the sole standard of appeal[9].—In the constitution of the Church

[8] The great lawyers of the Reformation introduced no new matter for the Ecclesiastical "Law of this Realm." As I have shown, they merely legalized the *Jus Canonicum Anglicanum*, the "Law of this Church."

[9] *Vide*, "The constitutions, statutes, and resolutions of the general Synod of the branch of the United Church of England and Ireland," *i.e.*, in New Zealand. (Auckland: printed at the Cathedral Press, 1862.)

in New Zealand, the Prayer Book is placed in a subordinate position, and the Thirty-nine Articles only made the standard of orthodoxy. With this standard before us, let us look at the position of the Church in New Zealand in relation to the daughter Churches in Australia, and to the mother Church in England.

Our Blessed SAVIOUR established one Religion, the Holy Catholic Faith, and one Kingdom. All those who profess the Catholic Faith, ought to be united into one visible Church; and, but for the divisions of Christendom which make it impossible, under one Primate of Christendom, one source of Unity and legitimate mission. On the other hand the state may be a monarchy, a republic, a democracy, or any thing else, and in each nation the municipal laws which govern the state are different. The form of civil government is mutable, but the polity of the Church is substantially the same throughout the world. Its status is a limited monarchy, limited by the Divine Canons, its government an aristocracy, and its Parliament an Œcumenical Council of Bishops. Whatever is essential to faith and discipline is contained in the ancient Canons—the 207 Canons[1] —the Ancient and Common Law of the whole Church, East, and West, and Anglican—the Public Universal Law, which all Catholics are bound to respect. This law was enacted by the most experienced Bishops, Saints, and Doctors of the Church, is the rule of life for all the citizens, is immediately based upon Holy Writ, and the two great primary laws, the ground of all duties and the source of all laws, was incorporated into the Roman Civil Law, justly called *scripta ratio*—the noblest monument of a great people that governed the world. With the Roman Civil Law the *Codex Canonum* passed into the law of all civilized nations, and became the Law here in Anglo-Saxon times. It is adopted into the National Common Law (the *Provinciale*), and is the basis of the General Canon Law (the *Jus Pontificium*), both of which received the sanction of the Temporalty under Hen.

[1] Nice, Ancyra, Neo-Cæsarea, Gangrena, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Calcedon—*i. e.*, the four general Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Calcedon, are to be held as law, and what is decreed in them. (Novella *Constitutio Imperatoris*, cxxxi.) By our sanction, the sacred ecclesiastical Canons have the force of law, which were set out and confirmed in the four sacred Councils. On the word "confirmed" there is this note by Justellus, p. 129:—"Under this word are included other Councils, which are included along with the selfsame four Œcumenical Councils in the same Codex of the Universal Church." The first Canon of Constantinople is No. 164; of Ephesus, No. 171; of Calcedon, No. 179 of the whole Codex:—in all, 207.

VIII. The *Codex Canonum* was of force when it was only *Jus Canonicum*, and is still binding when it ceases to be *Jus Regium*, the law of the Establishment, because it has its own intrinsic vigour, whether sanctioned by the Temporalty or not. The law of the *Codex* is mutable; but being immediately based on the Divine law, and sanctioned by the whole Catholic Church, it partakes of the immutability of the Divine law itself. As Almighty God willed the existence of the society of mankind by means of the two ties of Religion and Policy, like the law of nations, the Ancient and Common Law is an essential part of the Public Universal Law of the whole world, by which the society of mankind is governed.

The Thirty-nine Articles belong to Private Law. It is easy to see the difference between public and private municipal law, the law of the land. Private laws, by-laws, the laws of a *by—i. e.*, a town[2], relate to private individual interests. Public municipal law (an Act of Parliament) belongs to all the people of the land. A town might make a by-law to this effect; that every householder should spend a week every year, in a certain month in mending the roads, or forfeit a certain sum; but no one would think of imposing this law upon all England. But it is not easy to draw the line between Public and Private Ecclesiastical Law, because Ecclesiastical Law regards man as a member of one visible, supernatural body, with a supernatural end, rather than in his relations to his neighbour. Ecclesiastical Law has more of the public element in it than the Temporal Law.

I divide Ecclesiastical Law into public and private. Public, common, universal, belonging to the whole Catholic Church. Private, particular, individual, comprehending particular usages and customs, not subversive of the Common Law, and matters of opinion not matters of faith. The Church has to deal with different forms of civil government, with people differing in character, habits, customs, and wants; so that usages, views, notions, and opinions need not be in all places exactly alike. Still the constitution and government of the Church is essentially the same throughout the world. Because the Church is of immediate Divine institution, with an universal command—"Go and make disciples of all nations;" its essential laws belong to all nations, and the Public Universal Law cannot be restricted to a particular Church, neither is it capable of a national, private,

[2] By etenim prisca Saxonum lingua habitationem significare notant Antiquariæ rei peritiores viri docti. (Prælectio octava xviii. *De obligatione conscientiæ*, a Roberto Sandersono.) The great Bishop says: "By-laws are Local Laws, made at Sessions."

particular direction. Now the Thirty-nine Articles do not form any part of the Public Law of the Church of England, a complete body of divinity, or an explication of all Christian doctrine. They are only private, particular laws, made to meet the particular errors, wants, and necessities of a particular Church, at a particular period of her history. They are not Articles of faith, but only Articles of peace. Lately they have been conveniently used together with—though they form no portion of—the Prayer Book as a standard of orthodoxy, because they happen to belong to a highly penal statute of Elizabeth, which deals, not with the general ecclesiastical law, but only with the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles.

Now for the Church of New Zealand to take the private, particular law of a particular Church, made to meet her particular wants at a particular period of her history, as the sole standard of orthodoxy, is much the same thing as for Victor Emmanuel to take the by-laws of the Mayor and Corporation of the city of London as a suitable constitution for the new kingdom of Italy; or for Dr. Lushington to take the municipal law of England, with its Reform bills and turnpike Acts; as the law of nations. Public Universal Law is the bond to unite the daughter Churches to the mother, and to the Church of all ages throughout the world. The question is whether the Church of New Zealand belongs to Private Law or Public Law. And "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," is not the same thing as "I believe in the Thirty-nine Articles."

CHAPTER VII.

OF HABITUAL AND ACTUAL JURISDICTION, WITH AN APPLICATION OF THIS DOCTRINE TO THE ROLLS' JUDGMENT.

ORDER gives the capacity to have and to exercise jurisdiction. This shows the connexion between the two, but they are two different things. Jurisdiction, in one sense, is separable from order. Not that jurisdiction, *as to habit*, is not given with order. This leads to the difference between habitual and actual jurisdiction. First let us see the difference between a habit and an act. Potential existence means a thing that *may be;* actual existence means a thing that *is*. To take an illustration out of Horace: Hermogenes was a singer even when silent—that is *in posse*, not *in actu*—as Alfenus was a cobbler, with his last thrown aside and shop shut up, and wandering about after his own

devices—that is, a cobbler *in posse*, but only a cobbler actual when he was stitching leather soles. But as Order is a Sacrament, this distinction between the cobbler potential and the cobbler actual is insufficient. To take another illustration:—"And the LORD GOD formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives." When man was nothing but dust, nothing but earth, his mouth kissed it, and his hands embraced it; the LORD GOD breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives—that is, the natural life (*anima*) and the spiritual life—this was his state before the Fall, and man became body, soul, and spirit. The spiritual and rational life has its seat in the soul, which is an invisible substance, but still a substance. Now habitual jurisdiction, which answers to the rational life of the soul, is given with Order, but actual jurisdiction is given with the voluntary subjection of the faithful. Let us see how habitual jurisdiction passes into actual jurisdiction; how the power, faculty, capacity, habit is elicited and passes into act. The priesthood is like the one soul (*anima*) in the one body of the faithful, it gives life, growth, and sensation. The soul, as to its motive and sensitive part, is elicited by the power of matter; but as to its rational part and spiritual life, it comes from GOD. So the priesthood derives its motive power from the faithful, and is elicited out of the subject matter acquired by voluntary subjection; but from GOD, by means of the Sacrament of Order, the priesthood receives the power that belongs to the rational part of the soul. Thus jurisdiction is a double power—a motive power elicited out of the subject matter, and a power handed down from above. The spiritual power of the keys is given in Order, but actual jurisdiction is not given in Order, but only when the matter is given, the *fideles, plebs subdita*. A priest may have spiritual power, and yet be unable to exercise it because he has not the subject matter; he is a priest without jurisdiction. In the constitution of Boniface ("Contingit"), he is called *vagus*, which is the same as *vagabundus*. (Lynwoode, p. 95, Oxford, 1679.)

Order is indelible; but a Bishop without actual jurisdiction, is like a prince without subjects, or a captain without a ship; the habit cannot pass into act. The Bishop cannot deprive a priest of Order, but only of subjects. He retains the absolving power, but is without penitents; and a priest can no more absolve without penitents than he can consecrate without bread and wine, or baptize without water—he has no subject matter. A priest does not say—"I absolve thee," by the power of the Prince, or the Bishop, or the people; but "by the power com-

mitted unto me," that is, in Order, when the Bishop said, "receive the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins thou dost remit, they are remitted." A Bishop has habitual jurisdiction by Divine right; it belongs to the law of man to assign him a particular diocese, and the number of sheep to be committed to his care. The Church soon found it necessary to make an application of the Divine command:—"Go and make disciples of all nations," and to limit the Bishop's jurisdiction to a particular diocese.

Through neglect of the study of *Jus Canonicum* and the metaphysics of Law, the learned Judge in the Rolls' Court confounded *habit* with *act*—that is, Order with Jurisdiction. And this fallacy in his very first position is fatal to the whole judgment. In the report of the *John Bull*, Nov. 10, 1866, the Judge lays down the *status* of the Bishop of Natal as follows:—"As a Bishop of the Church of England, he could exercise all the powers conferred upon him under the first head of 'Ordo.' But he could not personally compel obedience to his mandates." Now by Order in the Church of England, in the Church of South Africa, in the Church of France, in the Church throughout the world, *he could exercise no power whatever*. Order, as I have shown, only gives the capacity to have and to exercise jurisdiction. Actual jurisdiction, *in foro interiori*, of a voluntary society is acquired by the voluntary subjection of the *fideles*. The coercive jurisdiction, *in foro exteriori*, of the Establishment, *which is annexed to the spiritual office of the Bishop*, as a successor of the Apostles, is derived from the Imperial Crown. "But he could not personally compel obedience to his mandates." Why? Because the doctrine of "rank and obedience," which is a fundamental principle of civil society and of the Church of Christ, assumes the existence of subjects. A Bishop without subjects is only a Bishop *in posse*. And when it has been proved that Order gives actual Jurisdiction, then it will be time enough for the learned Judge to show how the subject matter is to be dealt with, whether in the Establishment or in a voluntary society. Thought cannot create its own subjects. Moral philosophy assumes the existence of moral facts to be dealt with by the moral faculty. A faculty must have its own subject matter. The outward eye cannot create the enemies which fight against the body, or the inward eye those which war against the soul. All that an Erastian can do is to *transform* the subject matter belonging to the Church of Christ, into a mere function of the State—that is, when Order gives actual Jurisdiction. A wizard could transform a cottage into a palace, and cobwebs into tapestry in a lordly hall, and a nutshell into a gilded barge; but

still the subject matter must exist somewhere, if it be only a cottage, and cobwebs, and a nutshell. He could not make a phantom out of nothing. The witch in Macbeth could transform herself into "a rat without a tail," but she could not *create* a tail; and there was no subject matter of caudal appendage, belonging to the human form divine, for transformation. I conclude that thought without experience, moral philosophy without moral facts, metaphysics without physics, and actual jurisdiction without the subject matter, are impossible. (Consult Mansel's *Inaugural Letters on Psychology*.)

S. Peter received the power of the keys in the name of the whole Church, taken to mean all the *fideles*. If S. Peter be taken simply as one of the mystical Body, he represents the subject matter upon whom the power of the keys is to be exercised; if he be considered as the head of the Apostles, he stands for the whole Hierarchy of Jurisdiction, to whom the power of governing the Church was committed. The Hierarchy of Jurisdiction is in the Church Sacerdotal; but the Community cannot exercise it, because it is not a person: like a community of fellows of a college, or trustees, it must appoint a head. The Community has the Hierarchy of Jurisdiction as to *origin and power*, and the Prelate has it as to *use*. And what the Community gives, the Community can take away. Now that the Community of the Church in South Africa has deprived the Bishop of Natal of actual Jurisdiction, he is only a Bishop *in posse;* and, to refer to my former illustration, a Bishop *in posse* is no more entitled to pay than a cobbler *in posse*.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

Religion and Policy have God for their author.

Though united in Him, He has put the Ministry (Jurisdiction) into different hands.

Religion is antecedent to civil societies (*John Locke*).

There is an Universal Church with an Universal Ecclesiastical Law.

The Universal Ecclesiastical Law must be kept distinct from the Temporal Law of each civil society.

Ecclesiastical Law must be administered by Ecclesiastical Judges.

These principles are substantially derived from Gallican writers, and belong to Public Universal Law by which the society of mankind is governed.

EDMUND HUFF.

On Greek Rites in the West.

In all the services of the Latin Church, the *preces* immediately before the Lord's Prayer are always in Greek. Men do not say *Domine miserere,* but *Kyrie Eleison;* and during the offices of the Holy Week, according to the use of Rome, the ancient ejaculation of the Greek Church is still preserved in its own language —*Agios o Theos, agios ischyros, agios athanatos, eleison emas.*

These liturgical facts indicate a condition of things when Greek was the language, not only of the Roman Church, but perhaps also of other Churches in the West. Like fossils in geological strata, they are evidence of an earlier condition of the religious worship than that which now obtains, and it is my purpose in the following notes, to gather together whatever may bear on the existence of Greek Rites in the West.

The Church of Rome to which S. Paul addressed himself, was a Greek-speaking community. At the end of the first century, S. Clement addresses his Epistle to the Corinthians in the same language; and in the beginning of the third century the *Philosophumena,* attributed to the antipope Hippolytus, which gives a most graphic and satirical account of the doings of Pope Zephyrinus (A.D. 207), and Pope Calixtus (A.D. 220), describe a society of Greeks.

The value of the work of Anastasius depends upon records now lost, and except for facts occurring near his own times, we may not rely too much upon him; still the ritualistic notices are very curious, and are at any rate worthy of being noticed. Of the Liturgy in the time of Zephyrinus it is said:— "Hic constituit ut in præsentia omnium clericorum et laicorum fidelium, sive levita sive sacerdos ordinaretur: et fecit constitutum de ecclesiâ ut patenas vitreas ante sacerdotes in ecclesiam ministri portarent, donec Episcopus missas celebraret, ante se sacerdotibus adstantibus, et sic missæ celebrarentur, excepto quod jus Episcopi interesset ut tantum clerus sustineret omnibus præsentibus ex eâ consecratione de manû Episcopi jam coronam consecratam et acciperet presbyter tradendam populo."

Before this period, in A.D. 170, S. Polycarp came to Rome to consult S. Anicetus as to the observance of Easter. Eusebius tells

us (V. c. 24, *Hist. Eccl.*) that on this occasion the Pope ceded to the stranger the office of consecrating the Eucharist, *honoris causâ*. This was more than an act of fraternal communion, being a special tribute of admiration. He must have celebrated in Greek, and the Church in the West must have used leavened bread, as the question of the Azymes did not arise for a long time after.

In later times, as in the times of Athanasius (S. Athanasius, *Apol. ad Const.*, iv.), we can found no argument as to the general use of the Western Church, on the practice of Eastern Bishops celebrating at Roman altars, for it became a prevalent custom thus to typify the Unity of the Church as against Arian aggressions.

The number of Greeks who resided in Rome was enormous at the beginning of Christianity. This we learn from the classical authors. Being the capital of the world, all nations must have been represented; but the Greek element, as ministering to art and civilization, must have been the greatest of all. All the trades connected with luxury were in their hands. The more refined pleasures were ministered to by them.

But, although God had His own even among them, it was not from them at the beginning that the ranks of the Infant Church was recruited. There was a great predominance of Greek-speaking Jews, especially from Alexandria. These were they to whom S. Paul addressed himself.

Suetonius alludes to the Jews in the Trastevere making riots about one Chrestus, whereupon they were banished from Rome, and Aquila and Priscilla, whose house is still shown on the Aventine, as sheltering S. Paul, may, without entire historic improbability, have occupied the abode which tradition assigns to them.

But there was also a purely Latin Christian element, represented to us in the Bible by S. Cornelius and his household, and the Italian Band, which must have been a legion of Latin-speaking soldiers. Herod Agrippa was in Rome at the time of the death of Caligula, who had just before ordered his statue to be erected in the Temple at Jerusalem. Herod supported Claudius at his accession, who in gratitude gave him the Procuratorship of Judæa, in addition to his previous tetrarchies. Before this the Italian Band must have returned to Rome, and there was a street of the Cornelii not far from the Church of Sta. Pudenziana.

Repeating what we have said of the doubtfulness of the authority of Anastasius, we may get some indications of the relative proportions of the Greek and Latin element in the Church, in the second and third centuries, from the nationalities of the respective Popes.

	A.D.	
Evaristus	95	Græcus
Alexander	108	Romanus
Xestus	116	Romanus
Telesphorus	136	Græcus
Hyginus	137	Græcus
Anicetus	149	Syrus
Pius	145	Romanus
Soter	161	Campanus
Eleutherus	172	Græcus
Victor	185	Afer
Zephyrinus	197	Romanus
Callistus	217	Romanus
Urbanus	222	Romanus
Pontianus	230	Romanus
Anterus	238	Græcus
Fabianus	236	Romanus
Fabianus	251	Romanus
Lucius	252	Romanus
Stephanus	257	Romanus
Xestus II.	256	Atheniensis
Dionysius, a monk	259	Unknown
Felix	269	Romanus
Eutychianus	275	Tuscus
Cajus	288	Dalmatus
Marcellinus	296	Romanus
Marcellus	308	Romanus

Whatever be the value of this test, it will be seen that, with some exceptions, the Bishops of Rome are mainly Greek and foreign till the time of Pope Victor, A.D. 185, and after that they become generally Roman. And that there is some approximate truth in this division we gather from the certain fact that while the *Philosophumena* are in Greek, we have, forty years after this, the *Cyprianic Letters* in Latin. The names of the Roman clergy mentioned in them are Crementius the subdeacon (*Ep.* 9), Moyses, Maximus, Nicostratus (*Ep.* 27), and Rufinus (*Ep.* 31). The different nationalities indicated by these names suggest to us how mixed the races must have been amid the Christian community in the capital of the world.

But though Latin was used in the documents that passed between Rome and the African Church, the Greek maintained its place in the monuments of the departed Bishops. The Catacombs, among other very curious historical revelations, have supplied us with the tombstones of Popes anterior to A.D. 238; Pope Fabian, A.D. 251; Pope Lucius, A.D. 252; and Pope Eutychianus, A.D. 275; and the inscriptions on all these tombstones are in Greek.

On this de Rossi (*Roma Sotteranea Christiana*, p. 126), has the following most important reflection:—"Inscriptions so simple, and graven in Greek on such illustrious sepulchres, identify themselves with the Church of Rome of the third century, and declare the history and the use, which we should term official, of the Greek tongue in its solemn acts. But in the fifth century all this was most different, especially in the public and solemn inscriptions. That was Latin, and was borrowed from the style

and formulas which belonged to the genius of that age, most foreign to primitive simplicity [1]."

We have no record of the acts of the Roman Bishops which can throw further light upon this curious subject, but we find that just at the state establishment by Constantine, Pope S. Silvester wrote a treatise against the Jews in the Greek tongue: unless it be, that occurring as it does in a Greek catena, the catenator translated the passage for his own purpose. (*Fragmentum Operis adv. Judæos. Angelo Maio, Coll. Nov.* vol. viii. part 2, p. 26.) With this the use seems to have died out. When once the capital was removed to Byzantium, all the artisans and ministers of the luxury of the metropolis naturally moved with the court, and Rome was left mainly to its native and occidental population. This process must have taken place very effectually, for by the time of S. Leo we have evidence that that great Pontiff was actually ignorant of the Greek tongue. In *Epistle* 86 we find the following very remarkable passage:—"But I desire to know whether my letter, which I sent by the Deacon Balilius, to your affectionateness concerning the faith in our LORD's Incarnation while Flavian of holy memory was yet alive, was ever given to your brotherliness: because I suspect that it was not so since you have never given any indication concerning its contents. Clear knowledge with regard to the true synodical acts which took place day by day in the council of the city of Chalcedon is not possessed by us, on account of the diversity of tongues, and therefore I specially enjoin upon you, my brother, that you have all gathered into one volume, and translated accurately into Latin, that we may be in doubt concerning no part of what took place, and that nothing may be ambiguous, which, by your effort, may be brought to a full understanding [2]."

[1] "Titoli cotanto semplici e in greco posti a sepolchri sì illustri ben s'addicono alla chiesa Romana del secolo terzo; e ne dichiarano la storia, e l'uso, *che noi diremmo officiale* della greca lingua nei suoi atti solenni. Ma nel quinto secolo tutto era diversissimo segnatamente nella publica e solenne epigraphia. Questa era latina e improntata dello stilo e delle formole proprie del genio di quell' età della prima semplicità alienissime."

[2] "Utrum autem Epistola mea, quam de Incarnationis Dominicæ fide incolumi adhuc sanctæ memoriæ Flaviano, ad dilectionem tuam per Balilium diaconum miseram, fraternitati tuæ tradita sit, scire desidero: quoniam suspectam habeo, quod de ejus textu nullum unquam inditium reddidisti. Justorum synodalium quæ omnibus diebus concilii in Calchedonensi civitate confecta sunt, parum clara, propter linguæ diversitatem, apud nos habetur instructio. Et ideo fraternitati tuæ specialiter injungo ut in unum codicem universa facias congregari, in Latinum scilicet sermonem absolutissimâ interpretatione translatur: ut in nullâ parte actionum dubitari possimus, neque ullo modo esse possit ambiguum quod ad plenam intelligentiam te fuerit studente perductum."—*Ad Julianum*, p. 305. Editio Lugdun., 1700.

The only ritualistic indication of the condition of things thus described is in one of the old forms of baptism given by Muratori (*Liturgia Romana Vetus,* t. i. p. 540), where what was termed the traditio symboli occurs. Its date is circ. A.D. 498, but it was used in France circ. A.D. 750. After an address on the value of the Creed, the following remarkable rubric occurs:—"Then the Acolyth, taking one male child from those infants, holding him in the left arm, shall put his hand upon his head. And the Priest asks: *In what language do they confess our Lord Jesus Christ?* Resp. *In Greek.* Again the Priest says: *Announce their faith after what manner they believe.* And the Acolyth shall say the Creed in Greek, chaunting it to the end, holding his hand over the infant, in these words: *Pisteuo hisena theon pattera pantis cratoron,*" &c. Martene (*De Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus,* lib. i. cap. 3. act ii.) indeed says, "But although in the West the Latin idiom was always used for the Mass, it is clear that sometimes, in some parts of the liturgy, other languages were used. For at Rome, anciently, in the first Christmas Mass, the Angelic hymn was sung in Greek, as Anonymus Turonensis, in his MS. Speculum Ecclesiæ, testifies: "In that Mass the Gloria in Excelsis, which has been hitherto silent, is intoned. The Priest alone precents, and is followed by the choir: because one Angel announced the birth of CHRIST to the shepherds, and presently there was with the Angel a multitude of the heavenly host. We sing it in Greek, *according to the ancient use* of the Roman Church, to which the Greeks as well as the Latins formerly were obedient; and as a great part of the liturgy was introduced by the Greeks, the language was not less known than the Latin; moreover, as the LXX. interpreters translated the Bible from Hebrew into Greek, and thence from Greek into Latin, from reverence to the Greek tongue we sing in Greek the Gloria in Excelsis at the first Mass, but in Latin at the second. For it is right that the Greek should precede the Latin, as the mother her child." Wherefore from the time of Gelasius, before Gregory composed the introits of the Mass, all began with *Kyrie Eleison,* "LORD have mercy upon, *emas,* us."

Martene goes on to refer to a passage in Anastasius's *Life of Benedict III.,* where we learn that the lections from the Prophecies, Epistles, and Gospels were on certain days read in Greek and in Latin:—

"Verum etiam ætherio compunctus nutu, magnam Stæ. Ecclæ. ut idoneus Christi minister, curam corde purissimo indesinenter gerens, textum scilicet Voluminis, in quo constant veræ prædicationes Pauli, viz. Apostoli, aliorumque apostolorum epistolæ atque

prophetarum ordinabiliter constitutæ lectiones, quæ a subdiaconibus leguntur per cunctas ecclesiarum stationes, more solito sursum in ambone raptum, vel perditum a Stâ. Ecclâ. fuisse percipiens, captus magno vehementique sollicitudine tale dignum similiter volumen præparare studuit in *quo Græcas et Latinas* lectiones, quas die Sabato sancto Paschæ, simul et Sancto Pentecostes Subdiaconi legere soliti sunt, scriptores adjungi percipit mivæque operationis tabulis argenteis decenter adornans, Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ libenter obtulit." (*Viti Benedicti III.*, p. 304. Ed. Mogunt., typ. Joan Alben, MDCII.)

After asserting, on the authority of Amalarius, and of Anastasius in his Life of Pope Agatho, that Latin rites were from time to time, either in part or in whole, celebrated at Constantinople, he states that at the Council of Pisa, on its inauguration by Alexander V., the Epistle and Gospel were pronounced in Greek, and in Latin, and in Hebrew.

Purely occidental as was the monachism of S. Benedict, we find traces of Greek influences when the Order was settled in the neighbourhood of Grecian Colonies, as in the south of Italy. In the tenth century, the monks of Monte Cassino, on the Tuesday after Easter, proceeding from their monastery to the Church of S. Peter, sang the Mass, *Venite benedicti Patris mei*, with a bilingual chant, that is both Greek and Latin, to the end of the Gospel. (*Codex Cassin. temp. Bertharii, apud Martene, de Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus*, cap. 17, nu. 14.) At Naples, as we might expect, there is distinct reference to this in the constitution of the Church. "In the Life of S. Athanasius of Naples, attributed by some to Peter the Deacon, the author speaks of the laity with the clergy, as not ceasing in common prayer, in Greek and Latin, devoutly singing Psalms to GOD, and fulfilling the usual office without relaxation."

We shall return to the condition of the Church in the Neapolitan States, a little further on. In the meantime we must turn our thoughts to Gaul. Whether in the ancient rites of the Church of Lyons any trace of its Eastern origination may yet be detected is uncertain, but "In southern Gaul Latin had not entirely dispossessed the Greek in the fifth century. Greek was still spoken in Arles." This is the remark of Dean Milman, who refers to Fauriel, *Gaule Méridionale* (vol. i. p. 432). "A S. Martial à Limoges on chantait en grec, dans le premier siècle, à la Messe du jour de Pentecôte, le Gloria, le Sanctus, l'Agnus, &c. Ce fait est établi par un MS. de la Bibliothèque Royale (Impériale), 4to, 4458. (Jourdain, *Traduction d'Aristote*, p. 44)." It is thus given :—

Dom̄c Sca (sic).

Inclita refulget dies valde cunctis veneranda
Spiritus Sancti advenientis gratia consecrata.
De quo sachrosancta ita ante precinuit prophetia
Spiritus cuncta regit cunctaque replet cunctaque reformat.
St. Hoc.

Alias.

Paraclytus sanctus postulat . . . pro nobis gemitibus inexorabilibus, hodie Spiritus Sanctus inmensus ac æternus. Ropt. (sic) gloriam suam dans presentia beatis . . . omnia terrestria atque superna scientiam sanctorum karismata habet. Præstans linguarum noticiam. Alleluia.

Alias.

Discipulis flammas infundens cœlitus almas.
Spiritus omnigenis linguis reserans magnalia Christi.
Hoc ipsi perspicuas dicemus vocibus odas. Alleluia.

Alias.

Sanctus conveniens sanctorum pectora lustrans.
Spiritus IL quia terrarum flammavit regna canamus.
Hoc pectora confirmat linguarum clausa relaxans scientiam.

Alias.

Psallite candidati spiritus, Paraclyti laudem dicentis spiritus missus ab arche (sic) Patris reple igneis legum et hoc generalia intuendo omnia.

Ité alias.

Mystica Paraclyti virtutum flamma choruscans
Ecce diem dechorat cœlibrem cui Sallite laudes
Eia spiritus almi certe Patris verbum quoque spiritus idem
Repl. distribuens linguas Christi junioribus omnes, et hoc
Infera digniter et supera facta cuncta per ornans
Scienter angelicis modulis cœleste promite carmen. Alleluia.

Alias.

Hodie replevit Dominus corda discipulorum radiantia Spiritus Sancti. Alleluia.

Item Gloria in Græco.

(It is written in Latin characters, with an initial letter in black and white.)

Doxa Patri ke yo ke agyo pneumati, ke emin ke agis ke istus ednaston ednamis (sic).

Pangite jam socii, docuit quos Spiritus almus.

Ad off.

Confirma hoc Deus. Donum Sancti Spiritus, quod opera accipe dona in hominibus Tibi. of.

Psallentes et nos offerimus tibi vota canendo alleluia.

In Græco Sanctus.

Agyos agyos agyos Kyrrios o theos sabaoth, pliris ouranos ke i gi tis doxis, osanna en tis ipsistis. Eulogemenos o erchomenos en onomati kyrrius; osanna en tis ipsistis.

Agnus Dei in Græco.

O amnos tu theu de o tu patros, o eron ten amarcian tu kosmu, eleeson emas. Agne Dei fili patris qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis.

Ad Com.

Dum essent discipuli propter metum Judeorum congregati, factus est. Et apparuerunt illis dispartitæ linguæ tanquam ignis, seditque super singulos eorum, et repleti sunt.

Martene says that he recollects having read, in an ancient ritual MS. of the Church of Soissons, that, on the feast of S. Stephen, the Epistle of the Mass is sung in Greek and Latin. He also found the same in an ancient Missal of S. Gatien at Tours.

On this subject we cannot do better than quote the words of M. Fauriel:—"Ces études (grecques) avaient été très-florissantes aux troisième et quatrième siècles, et il y a tant lieu de croire que jusque-là les Grecs de Marseille et des autres colonies phéniciennes, les premiers instituteurs des Gaulois en littérature, avaient continués à leur fournir des professeurs de grammaire et de rhétorique. Mais au cinquième siècle les études grecques étaient en décadence complète dans toutes les parties de la Gaule.

"Il y avait cependant çà et là des écoles tenues par les professeurs grecs; il y en avait eu à Bordeaux, et ce même Lampridius si célébré par Sidoine Apollinaire comme rhéteur latin, n'était, à ce qu'il paraît, moins fameux comme rhéteur grec . . . . mais ces cas particuliers ne sont guère que des exceptions assez notables au fait général de la décadence des études grecques dans la Gaule, à l'époque dont il s'agit. . . . On ne peut toutefois douter que le grec, bien que sans doute altéré et corrompu par diverses causes, n'y fut encore l'idiome usuel d'une partie de la population; il est connu qu'au cinquième siècle le grec était encore l'idiome d'une partie des habitants d'Arles. Or, cette ville n'était point grecque d'origine, seulement elle avait été longtemps soumise

à l'influence des Marseillais, et quelque temps sous leur domination. S. Césaire y trouva encore en usage leur idiome à son entrée dans l'épiscopat de cette ville (*Acta SS.* Benedicti, tom. i. no. 11, p. 662)."—Fauriel, *Gaule Méridionale,* i. p. 432. Paris, 1836.

What was the origin of this Office? Was it the remains of a very early tradition?

"Il serait également (says M. Jourdain in his *Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote,* p. 43,) faux de nier que la connaissance du grec fut entièrement perdue dans l'occident durant le moyen âge, et d'affirmer que cette langue eut été cultivée avec fruit et par un grand nombre de personnes. Tout porte à croire qu'elle était possédée par plusieurs savants du siècle de Charlemagne."

In the *Chronicon Cœnobii Virginum Ottbergensis* (F. Paulin *Rer. et Antiq.* Germanic. Syntagma, 1698), Abbot Herman is mentioned as carrying his Greek Testament with him, and the University of Osnaburgh, founded by Charlemagne, is mentioned as having been established with a view to producing a bilingual clergy. M. Jourdain continues:—"D'anciens Chroniques nous apprennent que ce monarque la fit enseigner et en recommande l'étude dans plusieurs monastères d'Allemagne. Sous Charles le Chauve vivait Scotus Eriegena, traducteur de Denis l'Aréopagite. Charles le Bègue eut une discussion très-vive avec l'Empereur de Constantinople, qui ne lui accordait que le titre de πρωτοσύμβουλος tandis qu'il exigeait celui de βασιλεύς, mettant une grande affectation à imiter les usages grecs: il voulut faire de Compiègne une nouvelle Constantinople, et la donner le nom de Carlopolis. Un monastère qu'il fonda en Bourgogne reçut le nom d'Alpha. A peu près dans le même temps quelques évêques mêlaient des mots grecs à leurs signatures."

For this M. Jourdain refers to *De re Diplomaticâ* (lib. v. Mabillon, Paris, 1681; p. 456, tab. lvii.), and then he cites the instance of the Office of Limoges, which has just been given. M. Léopold de Lisle, the learned librarian of the Bibliothèque Impériale, states that these services are not uncommon, and refers to an interesting paper in the *Revue Archéologique* in 1863, by M. Vincent, on the Use of S. Denis, where there was also a Greek Mass. Availing himself of the occasion of a mistake made by M. Fetis, the Director of the Conservatoire at Brussels, in the second edition of the *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens,* M. Vincent proceeds to show how the usage of singing the Mass in Greek in that Church arose.

Dom Felibien does not allude to it, but in the treatise on

the *Antiquities of S. Denis,* published in 1625 by Jacques Doublet, a former monk of that Abbey, we find that on solemn feasts they chanted a double Gospel and Epistle, one in Greek and one in Latin, and that in commemoration of the Apostle of France, Dionysius the Areopagite, who was a Greek by birth. Elsewhere he says, that on the day of the Octave of the feast of S. Denys, they sing all the Mass in Greek; "even the celebrant says the Gloria in Excelsis in Greek, and two Epistles and two Gospels are also sung."

"It is to be observed that this use of the Greek chant for a part of the Divine Office, has its origin in the belief that S. Denys, the Apostle of the Gauls, is the same as S. Denys the Areopagite, an opinion established in France in the eighth and ninth centuries; and it is remarkable that this Greek Mass is by no means a special Liturgy such as those of S. Chrysostom and S. James, but has been formed by little and little by the simple translation of those parts only which in the Latin Mass are sung, as may be seen from the anonymous preface to the edition of 1777. In fact the Greek fragments are nothing more than a translation of the corresponding Latin." M. Vincent's conclusion is, that the composition of this Mass, inspired as it was by the piety of the monks to their patron, "n'en reste pas moins un œuvre de pure fantaisie et (je demande pardon pour l'expression) un véritable pastiche calqué sur la Messe latine." The only difficulty in assenting to this bold conclusion is, that the Creed has been retained with the single procession, and a very ancient form of the first clause in the Gloria in Excelsis is found in two of the MSS.

The Bibliothèque Impériale possesses three magnificent manuscripts, numbered respectively in the catalogues No. 2290, 9387, and 9436. The beautiful Missal, No. 9436 (which is still in the original jewelled binding, with the ivory Mary and John, though the Crucifix has disappeared), contains the Latin Mass of S. Denis, with the parts proper to each day of the octave of the feast, but there is no Mass entirely Greek. It is on two leaves placed in the way of an addition, that one finds the Gloria and the Credo only translated into Greek. There are in the same place two other Latin Glorias, with the chants now in use. The first has the chant of the Gloria of the Greek Mass of S. Denis, according to the editions of 1658 and 1777, and this chant is one that has been long in use in the Latin Church, as it is found in manuscripts at S. Gall and Einsiedeln in the ninth century.

The MS. No. 2290, having as title *Sancti Gregorii Sacramentarium,* is of the ninth century, and contains at the beginning the Gloria, the Credo, the Sanctus and the Agnus Dei, translated into

Greek, but in Latin characters, and without musical notation. The translation of the Gloria is the same as that of MS. 9436, and there is found a rubric written in letters of gold:— "*Dicitur* Gloria in excelsis Deo, *si Episcopus fuerit tantummodo Die Dominico sive diebus festis: a presbyteris autem minime dicitur nisi solo in Paschâ.*"

The Greek portions of this Missal are as follows:—

[The Latin is interpolated all through.]

Doxa en ypsistis theo ke epi gis irini en antropis eudokia enumen se eulogumen se proskunumen se doxologumen se eucharistumen se dia tin megalin su doxan kyrrie basileu ep uranie thee pater pentocrator kyrrie yie monogeni iisu christe ke agion pneuma. Kyrrie o theos o amnos tutheu o yios tu patros o eron tin amartian tu kosmu eleison imas oerontas amartias tu kosmu pros de ke tin deisin imon o kathimenos en dexia tu patros eleison imas oti sy i monos agios sy iomonos kyrrios sy i monos ypsistos iisus christos syn agion pneumati is doxan theu patrosa. amin.

[The Latin interlineated].

Pisteugo isena theon patera panto cratora pijitin uranu kegis oraton te panton ke aoraton ke is ena kyrrion iisun Christon ton yon tu theu ton monogenin ton ek tu patros gennitenta pro panton ton eonon fos ek fotos theon alithenon ek theu alithinu gennitenta upy ithenta omousion to patri din ta panta egeneto ton diimas tus antropus ke diatini meteran sotirian kathilthonta ecton uranon ke sarcothenta ec pneumatos agiu ke marias tis parthenu ke enantropisanta staurotenta te yperimon epi pontiu pilatu, ke pathonta ke tafenta ke anastanta te triti imera kata tas grafas ke anelthonta istus uranus ke kathezomenon en dexia tu patros ke palin ercomenon meta doxis crine zontas ke neerus u tis basilias u keste telos ke es to pneuma to agion to kyrrion ke zo opion to ek tu patros ec poreugomenon to sin patri ke yo sinpros kinumenon ke sindoxa zomenon to lalisan dia ton profiton is mian agian catholikin ke apostolikin eclisian omologo en baptisma es afesin amartion prosdoco anastasin necron ke zoin tu mellontos eonos. amin.

Agios Agios Agios Kyrios pliris
ouranos ke igitis doxis
osanna entys ypsistys
eulogemenos o ercomenos
en onomati Kyrriu
osanna entys ypsistis.

Oamnos tu theu oerontas amartias tu kosmu eleison imas.

The third manuscript in the Bibliothèque Impériale, is an Evangeliarum of the tenth century (No. 9387). I am indebted to M. Claude for permission to possess myself of his description of it.

The volume is composed of the Epistles and Gospels of the Sundays and Feasts of the year, in Latin, written in letters of silver on purple vellum. Moreover, between leaves 152 and 162 a cahier also of purple vellum, which appears to have been inserted in the thirteenth century, occurs, in which are written in Greek and in letters of gold the Epistles and Gospels of certain great Feasts of the year, viz. :—the Nativity, the Dedication of the Church of S. Denys, the Feasts of Easter and Whit-Sunday, and lastly, that of S. Dionysius the Areopagite, on which it was the custom to celebrate in Greek, either in part or in whole, the Mass. Moreover some of these same Gospels are found transcribed in the cursive Roman hand of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and even sixteenth centuries, on two sheets that remain whole, both at the end of the insertion and at the beginning of the book, and the transcription has been so made as to indicate the pronunciation of the modern Greek without attention to the orthography, for facility in reading.

One must observe particularly (fol. 159 vo.) a passage in the book of Wisdom xxxi. 8. 11, Vulgat. xxxi., which appears to be of the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century, of which the writing is so bad that it is difficult to recover the text at all. It varies much from the Greek, and is a translation from the Latin Vulgate, which in this place differs much from the Greek original. After this explanation it is clear that these three MSS. give the first germ of the Greek Mass of S. Denys, so that in the tenth century all that existed of this service was the Epistle, Gospel, Gloria, Kyrie, Credo, and that the subsequent filling in of the work is due to the dilettante and scholarly feeling of the monks. The intercourse with the East in the time of Charlemagne and his successors, and the attractiveness of the alleged identity of the two S. Dionysii account for the commencement of this curious custom.

In the Greek insertion of these most curious MSS., there are three periods of the work.

1. The Epistles and Gospels (i.—xii.) are written in gold in the thirteenth century.

2. At folio 159, an Epistle and Gospel in Greek (xiii., xiv.) are written in the hand of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth centuries.

3. There is a part transcribed in the sixteenth century, and

there is a version of the Greek in Roman characters according to the modern Greek pronunciation. The Office is not in accordance with the use of Paris.

That the minds of persons continued to be directed in France to the Greek rites at the very end of the sixteenth century, is clear from the publication of a curious Greek Office, to which my attention has been directed by M. Le Chanoine Bertrand, the learned author of *The Letters of Sophronius*. It is entitled, "*Η ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου*, Lutitiæ apud Fredericum Morellum, 1595."

It is apparently a translation of the Latin Mass, as well as of the *Pange Lingua*. Whether as a forgery or as a literary prolusion we cannot determine for what purpose this Office was printed. So late as 1810 a bilingual Office of the Virgin was printed at Avignon. It must be borne in mind that in the Abbey of S. Denys, as at Cluny, the custom of the Deacon and Subdeacon communicating under both Species obtained till the French Revolution.

In the Church of Milan there are some remarkable fervid ejaculations used on the Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent, so like the Greek Ektenæ, that one cannot doubt their Greek origin; but no manuscript is known to exist, which supplies documentary proof of this derivation.

But England possesses one of these precious documents. In King Athelstan's Psalter (B. M. Galba, A. xviii.), as it is on no very good grounds termed—a manuscript of different dates, but of which the part we refer to belongs to the early part of the ninth century—we have a short Litany, the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Ter Sanctus, in Greek, in the Anglo-Saxon character. The Creed is almost identical with that of Marcellus of Ancyra, of the middle of the fourth century. In the Litany, S. Michael, S. Gabriel, S. Raphael, S. Mary, S. Peter, S. Paul, and All Saints are invocated. Also at Cambridge, in the Corpus Christi College Library, there is a Psalter of the beginning of the fifteenth century, called Pope Gregory's Psalter, containing a Greek Creed. It must, however, be regarded as simply a translation of the Western Creed in its most complete form. (See Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, pp. 74—83.) There are no traces of Greek in any of the Scoto-Irish Ecclesiastical Offices.

The customs of the Church of Naples in the ninth century, receive further elucidation from a very scarce Italian work, in three volumes quarto, "*Dell' origine, progresso, e stato presente del Rito Greco in Italia, osservato dai Greci Monaci Basiliani e Albanesi*, libri 3, scritti da Pietro Pompilio Rodota, professore della Lingua Greca

nella Bibliotheca Vaticana, Roma, 1758." That author mentions in his preface that the two kingdoms of Naples and Sicily twice beheld the Greek Rite established in their churches. It was first introduced in the eighth century, when Leo the Isaurian, in his hostility to the images, transferred the authority of several churches from the Popes to the Patriarchs of Constantinople, who in the exercise of their jurisdiction, not only founded new sees, but laid themselves out to change the Latin Rite into the Greek, and to introduce the Oriental Discipline. The multitude of Basilian monks, who, driven out by the effects of the Image controversy, were affectionately received both by the Popes and by the inhabitants of the two Sicilies, contributed more to its maintenance. No less than fifteen hundred rich monasteries attested their popularity. Time passed, and these religious houses became lax and disedifying; they betook themselves to a mixed rite in the fifteenth century, and the Greek Rite would probably have perished out of Italy, had not the Albanians, driven forth by the oppression of the Ottomans, established themselves in those regions, and brought with them the native Greek Rite, which to this day they retain.

With regard to the first of these periods, it must be recollected that after the death of Leo the Isaurian in A.D. 741, the attacks on the Roman See continued in the eighth and ninth centuries, so that Leo the Wise, in a law promulgated in A.D. 887, formally placed the Churches ravished from it under the patriarchal authority of Constantinople, and Nicephorus Phocas, in A.D. 968, put in operation even greater violence to overcome the constancy of those who loved the Latin Rite. The Popes, for fear of worse evils, remained silent, and for more than three hundred years their power lay in ruins, during which time the Greek Rite made great progress, insinuating itself into the two metropolitan churches of Naples and Palermo. It passed to Policastro, Brindisi, Taranto, Bari, Trani, Otranto, Gallipoli, Nordo, and Alessano. It established itself at Reggio, Squillace, Tropea, Oppido, Nicastro, Gerace, Bora, and Cassano. It was found in Rossano, Cosenza, and S. Severino; in Sicily it penetrated to Messina, Syracuse, and Taormina.

This lasted till the Normans came in the eleventh century. They restored the Pope's jurisdiction, and, in a measure, the Latin Rite, but the exercise of the Greek was freely permitted. The city of Naples itself was a Greek colony, with Grecian institutions. The Greek language, declining under the domination of the Goths, recovered itself for a time during the time of Justinian, but Latin gradually reasserted its place.

In spite of the subjection of that city to the Eastern Empire, the Episcopal See was faithful to Rome. Twice the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs made attempts on it. First, when the Patriarch Anastasius induced for a moment Sergius, Bishop of Naples, to accept the title of Archbishop from him; and next when Constantine Copronymus sought to annul the nomination of Paul made by Pope Paul I., but they were not able to break the tie. Naples was full of Greeks and Latins, as Baronius (ad ann. 842) testifies:—"So that the double population, that is to say, the Greek and Latin, might be contained therein who should each for themselves separately, yet under one head, perform their sacred rites[1]." Thus in the thirteenth century there were several Greek parishes in the city, as Chioccarelli (*de Episc. Neap.* ad ann. 878) bears witness:—"Wherefore, a multitude of Greeks came from the East to Naples, either for the sake of business or that they might enjoy the pleasures of this city. And on account of this, in the parochial churches, there were priests of the Greeks who performed the sacred rites after the Greek fashion, but who, on stated days, were obliged to acknowledge the Church at Naples as their head and mother. However there were Greek priests placed over these Churches—S. George, in the Market-place; S. Januarius, ad Diaconiam; S. John and S. Paul, S. Mary, at the Rotunda; S. Andrew and S. Mary in Cosmedin[2]."

In A.D. 877, at the funeral of S. Athanasius, Bishop of Naples, Peter the Subdeacon states:—"There assembled both sexes and all ages, and in such way as they could to the best of their ability, the Greeks and Latins in their respective languages, sang forth with sweet tone the chant of psalmody[3]."

In a deed of the year 1305, about some property, one chapter describes itself as, "The whole congregation of priests,

[1] "Ita enim quod duplex populus contineretur in eâ, nempe latinus et græcus, qui seorsum suos quisque, sub capite tamen uno, peragerent sacros ritus."

[2] "Quâ de re Græcorum turba ab oriente Neapolim tum negotiorum causâ, cum quoque ut civitatis deliciis fruerentur, confluebant. Idcoque D. Neapoli parochiales ecclesias, Græcorum sacerdotes obtinebant qui Græco more sacra peragerent; quique statis diebus Neapolitanam ecclesiam uti caput et matrem agnoscere tenebantur. Erant autem Græci sacerdotes his præfecti ecclesiis S. Georgii ad Forum, S. Januarii ad Diaconiam, SS. Joannis et Pauli, S. Andreæ, S. Marci ad rotundam, et S. Mariæ in Cosmedin."

[3] "Confluebat uterque sexus et ætas diversa et qualiter poterant psalmodiæ cantus variusque linguarum Græci et Latini suavi modulatione resonabant."

Greek and Latin, in the Church of S. Januarius ad Diaconiam [1]."

In A.D. 1337, the Archbishop John Orsini reduced to writing and gave a new form to the pontifical ceremonies of his church, and on this head he appoints :—"On Easter Day, when the Gospel has been said, the Lord Archbishop commences the Creed in the Greek tongue, and if it so please him the aforesaid Archpresbyter of S. George in the Market, with his fellows, and the Archpresbyter of S. Maria Rotunda, sing it in the Greek language in the presence of the Lord Archbishop, and other singers in the choir respond antiphonally in Latin, singing with a loud voice [2]."

It is unnecessary to mention the fortunes of the Greek Rite in the provincial sees of the kingdom of Naples. In Sicily the same thing obtained; sometimes the Latin prevailed over the Greek, sometimes *vice versâ;* and at times we find a sort of mixture, as in the Church of La Cattolica at Palermo, in which, according to Benedict XIV. :—"In that Church, always from that time, the Divine Offices and the holy Sacrifices of the Mass are celebrated in the Greek language, but with the Latin-Roman Rite : for the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is consecrated in unleavened bread; the holy vestments and sacerdotal coverings are after the Latin pattern, and the Feasts are kept according to the Gregorian Kalendar, except those which up to this time have been observed with a religious devotion [3]." Here also was maintained the Office of Protopapa, who on the feast of the Circumcision and on Palm Sunday assisted at the Cathedral, and said some part of the Offices in Greek (Hofman, *Lexicon, verb. Protopapa*).

By the time that the sixteenth century had arrived, the Greek Rite, in the case of the Churches governed by the Greek secular clergy, had gradually died out; but it was not so in that of those

[1] "Cuncta congregatio sacerdotum Græci et Latini ecclesia S. Januarii ad Diaconiam."

[2] "In die paschali dicto evangelio Dominus Archiepiscopus incipit Credo in Græco sermone, si placet; et supradictus Archipresbyter S. Georgii ad mercatum cum sociis suis, et Archiepresbyter S. Mariæ Rotundæ decantant in Græco sermone in conspectu Domini Archiepiscopi; et alii cantores de choro repetunt alternatim in latino, cantando etiam in altâ voce."

[3] "Ecclesia semper a tunc temporis Divina officia et sacrosanctum missæ sacrificium Græcâ quidem linguâ, sed latino Romano ritu celebrantur : nam SS. Eucharistiæ sacramentum in azymo conficitur, sacræ vestes, et sacerdotalia indumenta ad instar latinorum adhibentur, et dies festi juxta Kalendarum Gregorianum servantur, præter ea quæ adhuc religioso cultu servantur."

Churches which were possessed by the monks and nuns of the Order of S. Basil. That Order was first brought from the East to the West in the beginning of the fifth century. Rufinus of Aquileia is said to have brought the rite from the East, and translated it into Latin at the request of Abbot Ursinus. It had a great effect on the Italian monks, and served to give consolidation and uniformity to the monastic life, which had hitherto been very varied in its institutes, "tot propemodum typi et regulæ erant, quot cellæ in monasteriis," as Cassian testifies (*Inst.* 22). This uniformity soon found its highest type in the great Rule of S. Benedict, which absorbed into itself all the monastic life of the West. Not till the fourteenth century do we find records of the Basilian monks as such, Montfaucon (*Palæog. Græc.*, p. 390) having pointed out a document of 1382, in which Cyprianus, Archimandrita monasterii S. Joh. de Terristi, Ord. S. Basilii, Squillacensis Diocæsis, adhibits his signature; but there is no proof of the modern institution of these religious, for not till the establishment of the Latin mendicants was it necessary to particularize the Order or to make the distinction. In fact the first Orientals who opened monasteries in Rome were the Armenians and the Greeks, who came from Egypt in the time of the Monothelistic controversies of the seventh century. These were followed in the next age by those who fled from the persecutions of the Iconoclasts. Of the monks who fled, some were established in the dioceses of Anagni and Velletri; others came to Rome, and had the church of S. Crisogonus in Trastevere assigned to them. Other monasteries, such as S. Saba, S. Prisca, S. Alessio, S. Gregorio, in which, during the next age, they celebrated the Greek service, as Joannes Diaconus testifies, and S. Cæsario, were opened to the Greek refugees. In the ninth century they also acquired S. Prassede, "that day and night by a psalmody of Greek modulation, they might diligently offer up praises to Almighty God, and to the Saints that rested in that place[1]," and S. S. Silvestro and Martino di Monti. Whether S. Maria in Cosmedin, sometimes called S. Maria in Scholâ Græcorum, was granted to the Greek monks is doubtful. But it was chiefly, as might be expected, in the kingdom of the two Sicilies, that the fugitive monks established themselves, though they did not long enjoy peace, being attacked and spoiled by the Saracens in A.D. 827. Matters, however, mended in the eleventh century, chiefly by the piety and munificence

[1] Diu noctuque Græcæ modulationis psalmodia laudes omnipotenti Deo, sanctisque illis ibidem quiescentibus sedulo persolverent. (Anastasius.)

of Count Ruggieri and his Norman followers. An immense number of houses were founded, in which the literature of the East was cultivated and a strict rule of life observed.

However in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, much of this disappeared. The monks became utterly illiterate and relaxed. Urban V., in 1370; Gregory XI., in 1373; Martin V., in 1424; and Eugenius IV., in 1446, did what they could to stem the torrent of decay. Certain Greeks from Constantinople, as Andronicus Gallinotto, and Constantine Lascaris, and Michael Glica, were appointed to aid in the work, and above all Cardinal Bessarion laboured, but with little profit. In the sixteenth century they continued so lax that Philip II. would have extinguished the whole Basilian Order but for the efforts of Cardinal Sanctoro, their protector.

After the Council of Trent, a reformed branch of the Order was established in Andalusia, as Santa Maria di Oviedo, and though some controversies arose among these zealous persons, they generally were distinguished for their piety and strict observance.

The Basilian houses, which at one time in Italy were said to number fifteen hundred, were, in the time of Rodota, reduced to forty-three; taken from under the jurisdiction of the Bishop, they were put by Gregory XIII. under the same rule as the other monastic Orders. In the Roman States their chief house was S. Maria in Grotta Ferrata[1].

[1] Grotta Ferrata, founded by S. Nilus in A.D. 1004, is a very interesting place, near Frescati, on the lowest spurs of the Alban hills. Commanding a glorious view of the Campagna of Rome, its machicolated walls, telling of a military occupation in the middle ages, dominate over a deep ravine, clothed with olives and the ilex. It was once immensely rich, owning land running down to the sea, as well as immense estates in Apulia and Calabria, but it is now the only house of the Order on the mainland of Italy, having no longer any abbot and but few monks. Nicholas, the tenth abbot, was employed by Urban II. as ambassador at Constantinople in the matter of the Azymes, in A.D. 1088. The Emperor Frederick II. lodged here in 1241, and Innocent III. and Gregory IX. date letters apud Cryptum Ferratum. This House gives SS. Nilus, Paulus, Cyrillus, Bartholomeus, and Lucas to the Basilian Calendar. In the twelfth century they were driven out by the Romans, and took shelter at Subiaco, returning when the troubles ceased. During the immediately succeeding period, they maintained the strictness of their rule, and did great service to learning by copying Greek MSS. They were again reduced to poverty in the fifteenth century. In 1507 there were only ten monks. The Library contains a number of Greek manuscripts, and several Euchologia, some of the tenth century, though many of their best MSS. are now in the Vatican and Barberini Collections. They use the Greek Office still, but with the Latin vestments and ceremonies. They say the whole Office on great days, but it is the practice at low Masses to miss out somewhat, and they introduce the

It has been necessary to premise this history of the Basilian Order, before describing the Service which they used. It is now very different from what was in use from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries. At first it was entirely Greek, according to the rules and traditions of the Oriental Church. It is now a mixed rite, partly Greek, partly Latin. The modern Basilians celebrate the Divine mysteries in Greek, but with Latin ceremonies. They avail themselves of the Liturgies of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom, but they use the Chasuble and Tunicle, offer in unleavened bread, and recite the Divine Office in the tenor of the rubric of the τυπικὸν, composed by S. Bartolomeo of Grotta Ferrata. Probably this mixed Rite dates from the time of Eugenus IV. and the Council of Florence. They now also wear the Benedictine habit. They are ordained according to the Latin Pontificale. Two attempts in the last century were made by two of the minister-generals—D. Pietro Menneti and D. Guiseppe del Pozzo—to get rid of the Greek Rite altogether, but this was resisted.

The third element of Greek thought in the South of Italy was that introduced by the Albanians. After combating with great valour under George Castriot, or Scanderbeg, the increasing Ottoman power in the fifteenth century, at his death they fled from their native homes, and at different times established themselves in Naples and Sicily. Again, in 1532, the inhabitants of Corone placed themselves under the protection of Charles V., and were by his power transferred into Italy, where they were enriched with many privileges, in suite of which other Albanian colonies established themselves. They were allowed the use of the Greek Service, though many circumstances tended to thwart and prevent its extension. In fact, in Naples, in many instances, the Albanians latinized, though in Sicily they continued to adhere to the rites of their fathers.

And now it will be asked, What bearing can such a subject as that which we have treated have upon the Questions of the day?

Elevation of the Host and Chalice just after the repetition of the Words of Institution, accepting Cardinal Bessarion's interpretation of the subsequent words of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost.

In one MS. of the fourteenth century, described by Goar as that of Falasca, and marked Γ. β. III., there are certain mixtures of the Latin and Greek rite, apparently chiefly in the rubrics, showing the gradual process of Latinization. The MS., which is probably Calabrese, exhibits a curious form of the Creed in stating the Procession τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς υἱοῦ ται (sic) ἐκπορευόμενον. Photius is commemorated in the Diptychs, and Roger of Sicily anathematized.

What place can a matter of dry antiquarianism assume when it is with social and theologico-political topics that this volume is concerned? Indirectly such questions are most important, in view of the mighty process of Re-union which is stirring the hearts of men, as the wearinesses and the doubts caused by three centuries of division are becoming intolerable. The relations that exist between Language and the true Religion are most interesting. It has been pointed out by one of the most eminent Hebrew Scholars and Theologians of the present day, how in the earliest measures of Divine illumination, God has communicated His Revelation to man in a Semitic tongue, which is deep, thoughtful, idealistic, and sublime; a tongue with few tenses, adjuncts doing the work of pronouns, and a copious vocabulary of roots, conceptions as it were in germ, to be developed according to the necessities of thought, in a systematic but most inartificial way. Taking the Arabic as the most perfect of this family, how remarkable is that simple verb with its numerous conjugations, the changes rung on a triliteral root, and the fecundity of the germs whereby the ideas are signified. All this is calculated to implant deeply upon an unindividual race, or family of races, the idea of the Illimitable, the Mysterious, the Intangible, the Unseen.

But the true faith has a mission of expansion. It is not enough that one nation shall preserve the notion of the Illimitable and the Immaterial as a protest against anthropomorphic ideas, and those tendencies which lead to idolatry. It must not content itself with having effected a mere lodgment in the mind of man. It must go forth to conquer. It must subdue the human race, first by reason, appealing to the intellectual part of man by speculation, and then to reason, appealing to man's moral nature by law: and so, in the fulness of time, the Divine Oracles were first handed over to the Greek (with the exception of the Sanscrit, the most perfect of the Indo-European family of tongues), a language of marvellous precision and beauty, clear, incisive, and lustrous, as the many-faced diamond. Here is no longer question of the expression of thoughtful and vague aspirations after the unseen. Religion is now submitted to a more rigorous test. It must prepare itself to cope with the intellect of man, developed to its highest power, and it therefore assumes the weapon for the conflict by adopting the armour of the adversary. The translation of the Holy Scripture, called the Septuagint, was an era of unfathomable importance in the history of Mind.

Then came religious law, appealing to the moral part of man, and here arose the mission of the Latin. A less perfect metaphysical instrument than the Greek, it is never so dignified as where it

embalms the behests of order and law. And therefore in those Churches where Christianity presents itself, emphatically as the "Obedience of Faith," where, avoiding Eastern speculation on the one hand, and Teutonic subjectivity upon the other, the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, as King James's Canon phrases it, have embodied the notion of law and order, the language of devotion and faith has ever been the sonorous Latin; always grand, whether we regard the rough grandeur of the Vulgate, the peculiar rhythm of the mediæval sequence, the flexible distinguo of the Schoolmen, the pretty hymn of Santolius, or the rolling period of the modern allocution.

And surely, in the great restoration of Church Unity, to which the prayers of so many earnest thinkers and pious Christians are directed, the great question of language will come to be considered. For the kingdoms and peoples who shall constitute the Catholicity of the Church will bring in their national characteristics along with them; the expression of their devotion will still remain vernacular; nay, a wise hegemony will respect and minister to such individuality in the services of our united Christendom. Thus the scanty hints we have gathered together here of the relations between the Greek and Latin tongues in the worship of God, will stand as precedents for that mighty unia, which shall express in that blessed hour the religious emotions of all Catholic Christians, and which, looking back to that wondrous day when Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia heard in their own tongues the wonderful works of God, shall stretch forward to the mighty concert of the great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, that shall fall down and worship God for ever and ever.

Alexander Penrose Forbes,
Bishop of Brechin.

Sisterhood Life.

I AM BLACK, BUT COMELY, O YE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM, AS THE TENTS OF KEDAR, AS THE CURTAINS OF SOLOMON.

Sisterhoods in the English Church are now established facts. Twenty years of struggles, reverses, successes, mistakes, and triumphs have passed since the first attempt at the re-establishment of Religious Orders; and the grain of mustard-seed, sown in that humble house at Park Village, has developed into a stately tree, full of vigour and life; expanding always more and more, giving shelter to ever increasing numbers, and victoriously battling with the storm. However opinions may differ respecting our Sisterhoods, they exist, and will continue to exist.

In the very early days of the present Catholic Revival, an almost general impression concerning the Religious Life was that it was something absolutely alien from the Anglican Church, and inseparable from disloyalty towards her. And this was the most lenient view taken of the subject by the World. There were not wanting some who assigned to those who sought to revive it the worst and vilest of motives. These last ideas have now well nigh died out, and the course of public opinion in the matter has been a very exact parallel to that of the heathen world on the same subject during the ages of persecution. As Roman society gradually changed its mind concerning the consecrated Christian Virgins, and, ceasing to consider them abominably wicked, calmly sneered at them as ineffably foolish, so now the English world. Sisterhoods are allowed to be in earnest, to have done some good. The Crimean war placed them before the public in a new light; the work is all very well; but —the Religious Life is madness and folly.

The Bishop of London, in his recent *Charge*, has expressed a strong sense of the usefulness of such institutions; but, looking only at their external effects, the Bishop regrets that their system assimilates so little to that of the foreign Deaconesses, and fondly looks forward to the day when increase of common sense shall induce the adoption of the Deaconess model. But the Deaconess system has been, and is being tried, in England; it fails, and has failed. The trial has been made in many ways, and at many

different times; has brought forth fruits such as the work of Miss Nightingale and her companions; has been encouraged by dignitaries of Church and authorities in the State, and has been lauded by popular writers and lecturers; and yet it fails. It does succeed in Germany. "The object at Kaiserswerth is 'to educate Christian women for the service of Christian love as far as women may serve, and that among all classes of the needy, the sick, the poor, the children, the prisoners.'" And this, the highest development which Protestantism can perhaps attain, is successful, and deservedly so, in a Protestant country. The pious German has been brought up in a subjective religion, which she carries with her into Deaconess life, and which suffices her, because she knows nothing better; but it will not answer in the Catholic Church, and, as the Catholicity of the Church in England is being continually widened and deepened, there is less and less probability that those who have once drunk of its refreshing waters will deliberately turn away to the barren and dry land of Protestantism.

But the popular objection is raised—"England is, and always will be, an essentially Protestant country; if you must have these Religious Institutions, why not take a Protestant, rather than a Roman model?"

"England's Church is Catholic, though England's self be not!"

Think of the distinctive difference between the English and foreign Reformations. The latter, essentially destructive, and having in itself the seeds of decay and death; the former, destructive also, in a measure, but only in a measure, and endued with latent energy and life. The foreign Reformers tore themselves away from the Church, the Church of England lent herself to the Reformation. "Every step made by the former has been in a downward direction; every step taken by the latter has been, through GOD'S goodness, a return to better things."

And, after all, Kaiserswerth is *not* a Protestant model. Fliedner took his ideas for its organization partly from the Moravians (who had formed themselves on the plan of the Third Order of S. Francis), and partly from the Béguines, a Religious Order, of which it may be observed, that it has never spread beyond Belgium, nor even beyond a few towns in that country. In copying Fliedner's system, then, we should have done no better than copy Rome at second or third hand: and it appeared wiser to go straightforwardly for what we wanted, to the Institute of S. Vincent de Paul, and to the Order of Hospitalières.

Another fact connected with this part of our subject may be

mentioned. Prussia is the country where the Deaconess system has been so successfully planted, and has brought forth such abundant and excellent fruit. Prussia and Russia are closely connected by mutual intercourse as well as by geographical position. But when Russia desired to found Religious Institutions, which should carry on such works as were flourishing at Kaiserswerth, she passed over Prussia completely, and not liking to apply to Rome, sought and obtained from England rules for the organization of active Sisterhoods. And this, be it noted, in spite of her intimate knowledge of the successful labours of the Deaconesses in her own immediate neighbourhood.

The so-called Evangelical portion of the English Church has been, in its day, the most honourable exponent of Protestantism within her borders: but in its most glowing prime, when men like Venn, Cecil, Wilberforce, and Simeon, were its glory, never did it attempt such work as this. The two names which stood conspicuous in the annals of female philanthropy were Elizabeth Fry and Sarah Martin: neither of them followed by any successors in their work: both of them belonging to Nonconformist bodies, and not to the English Church. How can the Evangelical school attempt such a work now, when, by its own confession, it is becoming powerless and effete? No. Catholicity is the one thing that must and will prevail: where it is not, a substitute may flourish in some degree, but where it does exist no other power can do its work.

There exists in England a Religious House ruled by a Chaplain peculiarly well adapted for the particular work he undertakes. The results are more satisfactory than in any other similar institution. The happiness and good conduct of the inmates while under his charge, and their subsequent well-doing in the world, are exceptional. The house and grounds and situation are all that could be desired for health, comfort, and beauty. To assist in the labours carried on in the House, the Chaplain employs "Sisters." (The inverted commas are used advisedly.) These ladies give their time, their strength, their heart, to the work to which they devote themselves. Its nature is engrossing and interesting, and at the same time, exceedingly exhausting to body and mind. As to the bodies of the workers, they are taken good care of; their minds are left out of the question. If women were simply living machines, the regimen of this House would suit them tolerably well; but as they are generally constituted, it is far from being the case. Their souls are fed with two mid-day Celebrations of the Holy Communion in each week, and with the routine of daily service and occasional sermons intended for the especial

benefit of the persons under their charge—and that is all. No guidance, no advice, no teaching not so much as the knowledge of those three vows of Poverty, Obedience, and Chastity, which have been the essence of the Religious Life ever since those primitive days when S. Antony took up his abode in the desert of the Thebaid, in the year 270; they are expected to be acquainted with their duty, to perform it, and to require no help. Many women, of various characters, and belonging to various schools of religious opinion, but, almost all, sincerely desirous of serving God, have entered that House with thorough determination to devote themselves to the excellent work carried on within its walls; but no one permanently remains there. It cannot be. In spite of the great and absorbing interest of the work, the utter absence of all spiritual assistance and internal rule is too intolerable to be borne for a length of time by any woman, although she might previously have had no idea that such guidance was needful, or even was desirable. A mind strained and harassed requires help and support; a community of strangers requires rule; and when these points are overlooked, body or mind, or both, give way.

And, if a Superior find it most difficult to rule rightly, though she knows the limits of her office, and uses all possible means of grace to assist her in the discharge of it, what must be the helpless state of one who neither knows the measure of her duty, nor the manner of its fulfilment? Such knowledge does not come naturally, and requires a learned, wise, and patient teacher to instil it. If Sisters, truly so called, find it difficult always to dwell together in unity, how much less can those do so who are assimilated by no common rule, and bound together by no sacred tie? The result of this false liberty is simple anarchy: heartburnings and disputes embitter the weary days, and one good woman after another leaves the work she heartily loves, either to return into the outer world, or to enter some regularly organized Sisterhood, of which she soon becomes a valuable and valued member. This account is absolutely unexaggerated; and the House, with all its external advantages, is often left almost entirely destitute of workers. And wherever institutions, professedly religious, are founded, as this is, on nothing more religiously substantial than a basis of miscalled common sense, the same failure must inevitably ensue: and the worst effects of the Deaconess system will be apparent. To that system, the peculiarities of the House above described are closely allied. It is also under the immediate jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, who is however probably unconscious of the existence of so strong an argument against

his theory as is contained in the internal working of that Institution.

The *Pall Mall Gazette*, last autumn, contained certain letters advocating the reform of our ordinary system of hospital nursing, and the advisability of placing such nursing under the superintendence of regularly organized religious bodies. Mr. Capes wrote thus:—"It is only by enlisting in this great work the services of those who are in themselves women of conscientiousness and delicacy that this one among the crying social evils of the day can be encountered with any hope of victory. . . . . If the unmarried and cultivated women of the middle and upper classes are to devote themselves to so trying a work, it must be on the condition that it supplies them with something like a real and permanent home for themselves. . . . . That educated and conscientious women could thus associate together in communities without some distinctly recognized religious bond, appears to me, I confess, simply impossible. . . . . It is the merest bigotry to refuse the services of a community of devoted women because they are under the guidance of a clergyman who wears a chasuble and feel a pleasure in seeing clouds of incense floating in their private chapel . . . . Clerical advice, clerical companionship, and clerical ministrations are essential to the happiness of the large majority even of highly educated women. . . . . Is it not our best wisdom, in the present condition of our poor and of our paupers, to set aside our dislike of clerical pretensions and of the eccentricities of devout women, and to encourage the vast body of unmarried Englishwomen to come forward to the relief of the destitute on their own terms?"

Then up rose the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and, in a leading article did battle against its dangerous correspondent. Mr. Capes' theory, unfortunately, was founded on half truths, and therefore, not calculated to stand heavy fire: but his ideas and those of his reviewer fairly represent the attitude now assumed towards Sisterhoods by the World. Some men, with Mr. Capes, decide that the "nonsense" ought to be put up with, for the sake of the good that may be done. Others, with the popular newspaper, hold the contingent evils to be so immeasurably greater than the possible benefit that the whole thing ought to be put down at once. "As matters now stand," says the *Pall Mall*, "the domestic and social ideal is, practically speaking, the one generally recognized by Englishwomen as the highest to which they can aspire. To be a good wife, mother, daughter, or sister, is, so to speak, the highest ambition of a woman; and if, having from circumstances no such duties to perform, she occupies herself in charitable

pursuits, she still does so without cutting herself off from society at large, or removing or weakening those ties which every one possesses more or less. If she is a sensible person [she] is able to take a proper measure of charitable occupations, to think of them in their true light as occasional pursuits forming a part of life, and not as an absorbing profession taking up the whole of it. 'Recognize and heartily encourage' the ascetic monastic system, and you change all this." Proceeding to the still more "specific" danger of bigotry, we are informed that "the chasuble and the incense, and much of what they symbolize, are superstitions as degrading to the mind as habitual drams are to the body, and work which cannot be done without the one or the other stimulant is work for which the person who requires such stimulants is unfitted by nature." The "pernicious nonsense" and superstitious state of things being thus held up to condemnation, the same writer kindly goes on to offer a substitute for the Religious Life—"We by no means intend to assert that female clubs in which unmarried women might live, and from which, if so disposed, they might occupy themselves as many other ladies living in their own homes do, with charitable undertakings, would be bad things. In some cases we think they would be very good things. The sectarian and clerical element is what we dislike."

The soundness of Mr. Capes' theory as to the employment of Sisterhoods in our hospitals is proved beyond any doubt, by the excellent state of the University and King's College Hospitals, in both of which that system is carried out.

Dr. Jenner, Physician in Ordinary to the Queen, and Physician to University College Hospital, states :—"The Sisterhood at All Saints' Home have nursed the patients in my wards in the most exemplary manner. No words of mine could express the difference between the nursing as now performed and as formerly attempted. The whole tone of the wards is changed. I feared before they came to the Hospital that the ladies would (as I had heard of others doing) step out of their province in various ways, and so interfere with the general usefulness of the charity. *Now* I can truly say that, in my opinion, the greatest misfortune that can befall the inmates of University College Hospital would be the withdrawal of the Sisterhood from the work they have undertaken, and have so admirably performed."

The subject of the "chasuble and incense," and clerical guidance, is that in which Mr. Capes fails to grasp the real truth, and therefore offers a weak point to his opponent. He is not aware how very little clerical guidance many Sisters receive: much less than falls to the lot of many women in the world. In one

Sisterhood especially, and that one of the most noted and earliest established, Priests are systematically excluded from all but the infrequent administration of the Sacraments. As to the other subject, both Mr. Capes and his reviewer seem to forget that they are dealing with *Christian* women. These women have read in those Bibles which both writers profess to regard as the fountain head of Religion—"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." They then, loving their LORD more than any human love, go out to serve Him in His poor. But though a labour of love, it is one which requires more strength, more patience, and more perseverance than nature only can supply. Therefore, because their LORD has promised to give all treasures of strength and grace in the Blessed Eucharist, they turn thither for the help they need. They are only obeying GOD. And if they read their Bibles, they thence learn that that Holy Sacrament is full of the most mysterious and glorious wonders; that there is nothing beyond its ineffable majesty except the Beatific Vision itself: and, believing this, how can they bear not to surround the celebration of those Divine Mysteries with every adjunct of dignity and symbolism which circumstances will allow? Primitive Christianity showed the example: and our modern Sisters do not profess to be wiser than Evodia, Syntyche, and Phœbe. "Stimulants" such as this, they thankfully accept when they have the opportunity: and they also are thoroughly well able to subsist without such means of Grace, whenever, through the exigencies of their work, those means are unattainable. She who most gladly, most thankfully kneels at the Altar-step to receive the Bread of Life, can likewise most cheerfully and patiently spend weeks and months, nursing CHRIST'S sick poor in a squalid lonely cottage, far from sound of church-going bell, or sight of one familiar face: spending day and night in wearying and incessant drudgery, and in occupations loathsome and exhausting; with little privacy and less rest.

Were it true that Sisterhood Life were founded on so false a basis as human help and religious æstheticism, its opponents might very well comfort themselves with that saying, on which our Sisters now dare to take their stand:—"If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of GOD, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against GOD."

At the same time, it must be distinctly affirmed that a regular religious training is necessary for the carrying out a life of charity in a religious spirit. This training is met with in the

rules and exercises of those communities called Sisterhoods; in the frequent hours of prayer, the periods of retirement, of study, and also of rest. It cannot be for a moment admitted that charitable works are invariably to form a merely casual part of the occupations of life. It is difficult to imagine how any one can deliberately give utterance to such a sentiment. Such a person can have little idea of the mass of wretchedness, and ignorance, and vice, existing at our very doors, which cannot be relieved or reformed without the whole energy of life being thrown into the endeavour. But this is exactly what respectable people dislike so much: any thing which gives them a hint that there may be a higher form of piety than that which tries to keep just clear of the brink of perdition, and to get its votaries just within the gate of Heaven—a torpid state, without any disquieting fear or exciting love; very tranquil and very comfortable; domestic felicity, the prototype of heaven.

The English mind, in these days, has been unpleasantly startled from this serene dream, by the efforts of enthusiastic hearts to serve GOD and their neighbours more thoroughly and more lovingly; and its immediate impulse is to put a stop to all such aspirations and designs as seem to cast a slur on its own favourite style of religion. It would be better at once to face the truth, that no religion can be real without involving some degree of effort and self-denial, and that domestic life, however pure and peaceful, is not the only ideal of human perfection. Those who give up all earthly things for GOD, are, it is true, a tacit reproach to those who only "make offerings to the LORD their GOD of that which doth cost them nothing." But it is the friendly smiting of the righteous, more wholesome than the precious balm of those who say—"Peace, peace, when there is no peace." It is certain that all are not called to the Religious Life (technically so styled); but it is equally certain that no one is called to a life of sloth and self-deception.

The practical working of the proposed "female club" would soon show the fallacy of that system. Its members must either work independently or in community; the latter plan, we say, cannot be carried out on a merely secular or human basis; the former is open to serious objection. For, when the zealous labourer, overtaxing her strength, as she is almost certain to do, fails at her accustomed post, who is to supply her place? An organized staff of workers would here have no difficulty, but what can a solitary, worn-out woman do? Change of work, and occasional rest, will keep a number of persons who share one common life in a state of health and readiness of

exertion. But how can this be obtained by the single labourer, who has not the heart to cease from her toils as long as she has power to move, because all depends on herself, and the misery she is attempting to stay would rush on its victims with renewed force, if her resisting hand were suffered to drop? Put the work in the hands of a community, and that anxiety is ended.

Excellent women, incapacitated by family duties from giving more than a small portion of time to works of charity, feel keenly how imperfect must be their sympathy, and how inadequate their labours among the poor. Sisters of Mercy stand on a very different footing:—

> "How probe an unfelt evil?
> Wouldst be the poor man's friend? must freeze with him—
> Test sleepless hunger—let thy crippled back
> Ache o'er the endless furrow; how was He,
> The Blessed One, made perfect? Why, by grief—
> The fellowship of voluntary grief—
> He read the tear-stained book of poor men's souls,
> As I must learn to read it."

There is much concerning the organization and ordinary routine of Sisterhoods which, with some advantage both to the Church and the World, might be better and more widely known. Many mistakes have been made, many errors have been corrected, many experiments have been tried; some have failed, and some have succeeded. This new phase of life, springing up in the midst of our great Church Revival, as one of its inevitable adjuncts, has burst forth with the inexperience, but also with the vigour of youth; and, as its young eccentricities and errors are gradually pruned away, it becomes ever more strongly and firmly knit together in itself, and changes more truly into the likeness of its calm and saintly prototype, the Religious Life of the early Catholic Church, the lily-work which crowned the pillars of the Temple.

First, then, of the nature of a Sisterhood:—What it is *not*. A Sisterhood is not a mere society of well-meaning women, agreeing to live together and do good. It is not a refuge from trouble and temptation. It is not a short and easy way to Heaven. It is not a house of bondage. Or, if it be any of these things, it is false to its profession.

Next:—What it *is*. A Sisterhood is a society of women, called of God to follow the Evangelical counsels, and united

together for the purpose of obeying that vocation to the best of their powers; separated from the world, not for the mere intention of carrying on some work of mercy, but for the higher purpose of treading the narrow path of Poverty, Obedience, and Chastity. Such is the groundwork of Sisterhood Life; all things external to these essentials are merely accidental.

The World cannot understand the irresistible might of Vocation. Abraham felt it when he was called by GOD, and went out, not knowing whither he went. So did the Apostles, when they left all that they had and followed CHRIST. When GOD calls a soul to that greater nearness to Himself which finds its outward expression in the Religious Life, that soul cannot hang back without perilling its salvation. Therefore, abuse, satire, and ill-treatment, are powerless to turn such a one from her purpose. GOD'S Will is stronger and dearer than the will of man.

But the troubles of this Religious Life are as great, its temptations are greater, and far more harassing, than those commonly met with in the world. It may be a way to Heaven, a way to greater glory and a brighter crown: and, if so, it is a way rough with unforeseen obstacles, laborious with strange difficulties, and needing nothing less than special grace to bring it to a happy issue. It may also be a way to fuller and more bitter condemnation; and, as such, it may be easy and direct. For great privileges involve great responsibilities; and those who are thus called apart to a closer walk with GOD will be far more strictly judged than others. A state of bondage it is not; because it is one of obedience to GOD, and, where the Spirit of the LORD is, there is liberty.

It would be foolish to ignore the mistakes that have been made concerning all these points. The consideration of some of them may tend to a better comprehension of the true spirit of the Religious Life. Putting aside further reference to the errors of the external world, we find many others entertained by those more intimately connected with the work. Postulants, Novices, Sisters, have all their own mistakes to avoid or to fall into.

I. And first, to consider the case of Postulants, the technical name of those who enter a Religious Congregation on trial, making no formal engagement, assuming no absolutely distinctive dress, but keeping the Rule of the House while residing in it. These persons, more often than not, come without true vocation; led by romance, affection for some particular Sister, fondness for some particular work, distaste for natural duties, desire to escape from unpleasant homes or obnoxious engage-

ments: or, perhaps—most unworthily of all—by the wish to rise in social position. Considering that the state of life for which they offer themselves is, in its reality, one of single and simple union with GOD, and that the soul truly called to it can take into consideration neither the temporal things she leaves or enters on, but simply follows where, and when, and as her LORD directs—these low motives are sufficiently awful to contemplate. Not but that, as S. Francis de Sales says, "vocations grow," and the unworthy motives which turn many, in the first instance, to the Religious Life are often, by GOD's grace, purified—sometimes by a bitter process, but sometimes not at all. O miserable life; so begun, so continued, so ended!

As to romance as a reason for entering the Religious Life—that soon fades away. There is no room for sentimentality in the stern reality of that on which they desire to enter. It is true that some minds, romantic in a Roman direction, envelope themselves in a rosy haze, which commends petty trivial developments of the Oratorian school much more strongly to their minds than any wholesome food they can get at home; and they naturally end by going where they hope to satisfy themselves more fully; not warmly welcomed by the Communion which they join; not deeply lamented by that which they forsake.

Disappointment awaits every one who enters a well-organized Sisterhood for the sake of enjoying the society and affection of any particular Sister. Not only are frivolous intimacies discouraged on principle, but, in point of fact, there is no time or opportunity for long private intercourse; and the time-tables apportioning each Sister's daily and hourly life prevent her following the bent of her own wishes as to her associates not less than as to her manner of spending her time.

The desire for individual work in a Sisterhood is a more plausible, but not a less real deception. It is true that GOD sometimes gives a distinct vocation to some particular sphere of labour, but then He also gives a spirit of implicit obedience to superiors. As, in the history of S. Simeon Stylites, we are told that the Bishops of the province, startled at his peculiar mode of life, sent certain priests to test his vocation. These, having arrived at the foot of his pillar, commanded him to descend. The holy man forthwith put one foot down from the pillar, in preparation for immediate compliance. But his judges, seeing his prompt obedience, bade him stay where he was, for they perceived that his vocation was from GOD. Yes! But that is the very reverse of the ordinary conduct of those who consider themselves called to special kinds of occupation. It is all the differ-

ence between the spirit of worldly self-will and the spirit of religious obedience[1].

Much the same feeling actuates those who come to escape disagreeable duty; and although they may honestly fancy themselves called by God to leave it for the Religious Life, their subsequent conduct often proves them to have been mistaken; and they show themselves no more inclined to endure hardness after their profession than before. No Postulants turn out more unsatisfactorily than those who offer themselves for community life because they cannot have their own way at home, or cannot live in unity with their own kindred. When the novelty of their position has worn off, their self-will and discontent rise up again as strongly as ever; and, after causing much discomfort and trouble to all around them, they generally fly off to some fresh and untried scene of action, or return to the former situation, which had previously been so intolerable. These are they who cause most annoyance in a Sisterhood, and most scandal in the World. Their hyperbolical and foolish praise of the Institution on first joining it, is as pernicious and disagreeable as their sweeping condemnation of it when its novelty has worn off. And though charity, hoping all things, sometimes admits unfit persons such as these into a religious Community, they too often prove a most sore thorn in its side.

"Et en général," says S. Francis de Sales, "on évitera de prendre des filles ou femmes qui soient mutines, ou opiniastres, ou trop égarées, et folastres; les unes s'arrêtant trop à leur propre cervelle, et les autres ne s'arrêtant à rien."

It may be thought cruel to suppose that any persons wish to enter on this Life for the sake of rising in social position; but what, if, in the present state of English society and English Sisterhoods, it is absolutely true? It is an insidious motive, often veiled even from the very person actuated by it; and therefore all the more necessary to be guarded against. Superiors and Chaplains of Sisterhoods will do well to look to this matter. The evil is one which has spread widely and perniciously among our candidates for Holy Orders. In Sisterhoods it has not yet had much scope, and is still rather a danger of the future than of the present; but yet, as a danger, it cannot safely be ignored.

[1] Those who look on S. Simeon Stylites as a mere crazy fanatic, no better than an Indian fakir, are careful to omit the great practical work of his life, as an unwearied and successful preacher to the crowds which were wont to flock around his pillar, and as a sagacious adviser of individuals amongst them.

"La simplicité est charmante, et il n'y a rien de plus difficile." La Rochefoucauld's worldly wisdom never pierced deeper than in that maxim. It is the one secret of true holiness, which many earnest people never attain, and which places its possessor near the Saints of God. Simplicity is given to some, a lovely grace, almost without their seeking it. Others labour long and wearily to attain it. Others again, never seek and never find it, and yet, in their way, lead religious lives. But it is the one thing needful on entering a Sisterhood. A pure, single, true heart, offering itself wholly to God, seeking for nothing again, but gratefully accepting all He may be pleased to give—that is the heart for a Sister. Where that is, other graces will not be needed, or will be given; where that is not, nothing else will suffice.

II. As to Novices. Under this head there are two curious ideas to which it may be well to advert, because, though worse than absurd, they are in no wise uncommon. Some women fancy that on entering a Sisterhood, they are authorized to lay aside all intellectual culture. This singular theory, savouring of the Puritan doctrine—That God needs no man's learning, might also be refuted by the answer—That He certainly needs no man's ignorance. Yet it is not confined to Sisters only, Some years since, a father and mother, intelligent, well-educated Catholics, deliberately stopped their daughter's education, except as to drawing and music, when, at the age of thirteen or fourteen, and with her parents' consent, she made up her mind to enter a Sisterhood so soon as she should be old enough. When, some years after, in the course of her Convent life, she had a French devotional book placed in her hands, she was obliged to make use of a dictionary to assist her in discovering its meaning. The adjunct, to say the least, was inconducive to devotion.

Indeed, Sisterhoods might be far more valuable than they are, could their members only realize that they are still responsible for the various talents with which God has gifted them, and that they will have to account for them at least as strictly as if they had continued in the World. Because nature, as the Schoolmen said, abhors a vacuum, does it therefore follow that grace rejoices in it?

Besides the direct duty to God involved in mental culture, there are other reasons which render it of extreme importance. Every one knows that one of the worst points about many Roman Convents, more especially those of the Cloistered Orders, is the frivolity and childishness of their inmates. But that is a state into which every Community of women

will fall, if not guarded against by persevering and hearty efforts to occupy and improve the mind. Those Sisters occupied in School teaching must, in order to do their duty fully to their pupils, devote some time and pains to secular studies. And it is difficult to understand why education should be considered an unspiritual employment; for the idea seems rather connected with Manichæism. Sisters gifted with peculiar talent for music, painting, or any other art, can generally, if they will, find scope for its employment and sanctification. Before all Sisters lies a wide expanse of wisdom and learning, couched in different tongues, compiled in various ages, all relating to their own duties, their own lives, their own hopes. And the arrangement of their Daily Services, with their changing Antiphons and Responses, point the way to such deep researches into the hidden things of Holy Scripture, that it becomes almost unpardonable for any Religious woman to abstain from acquiring knowledge, if she have but average ability and a modicum of leisure.

The second of the strange fancies to which reference has been made is, that a Sister may lay aside the common courtesies of society with the secular dress. It is fair to say that this notion is chiefly entertained by young women, who look on their new home just as some girls regard school, as a place of emancipation from the restraints of a strict home, and one in which they may be as boisterous and ungovernable as they please. The end of that mirth is heaviness. Patience would be wanting in true charity, if it bore long with such a state of things, which can only be mended by dismissal of the offenders, or by their hearty and patient struggles for amendment. But some really honest pious women think it absolutely a part of their religious duty to be blunt and abrupt to those about them, unconscious of the stumbling-blocks they are casting in their Sisters' path, and forgetful of the examples of God's Saints, and the teaching of His Word.

Some Communities fall into an opposite mistake, and legislate concerning the minutiæ of politeness and deference to a point which produces great danger of unreality, and affectation. This may be the worse error of the two; but it is difficult to understand why either need be committed, so long as Religious women are endowed with common sense and good feeling.

But the chief mistake made by English Novices in the present day is the idea that the assumption of the dress is simply all that is needful. They come to be Sisters, and they are Sisters. The doctrine is easy, and pleasant; but not very sound. Of course, in certain Sisterhoods, where the importance of the subject is well understood, there are no limits to the pains taken with the

instruction and training of the Novices; but in others, this mistake is often made and acted on, in spite of its proverbial falsity. Let us hear S. Francis de Sales on the matter; remembering that he was writing for the Sisters of the Visitation, an Order peculiarly free from injudicious strictness:—"On the good nurture and direction of the Novices depend the preservation and welfare of the community: therefore, the mistress who shall take charge of them, must not only be discreet, gentle, and devout; but she must be the perfection of wisdom, gentleness, and devotion; in order, with a more than mother's love, to raise her Novices step by step to religious perfection, as future brides of the Son of God. . . She shall be relieved, as far as possible, from all other business, that she may better attend on this most important office. . . She shall exercise the Novices in humility, obedience, gentleness, and modesty; shall make them brave, and cure them, as far as she may, of those follies and fancies which so often weaken women's minds; and all this, in order that they may be strong to do great and perfect works."

The Novitiate is, in truth, a period so important and so critical that on it hangs the rest of life. Well used, it becomes an armoury whence the professed Sister issues well prepared at all points to meet her many trials and vicissitudes: wasted, it is a weight about her neck dragging her downwards. It is a time never to be recalled; a never recurring opportunity of laying up stores of wisdom and knowledge, the need of which she will soon and sorely feel.

There are in existence histories of mediæval Sisters; histories so old that they were originally written on tablets of wax. There are sermons extant, which were preached in Religious Houses, whose names have long been forgotten. There are instructions for Nuns, composed by Abbesses whose Convents have long since mouldered into dust. And these institutions, and sermons, and histories, might all have been intended for the freshly reviving Sisterhoods of the present day; so exactly parallel are the graces, the needs, the glories, the mistakes, the victories of those and these.

III. Into the inner trials and temptations of a professed Sister's life, this superficial Essay has no right to enter: further than this one word. A woman who, obeying her Lord's voice, gives herself wholly up to Him, knows that when He called her to do so, He pledged Himself to be All in all to her. She lays her weakness at His feet, and is very certain that He will give her His strength. She is assured that, if she is but true to Him, she shall be more than conqueror, through Him; and she learns to

glory in her tribulations, to account the reproach of CHRIST better than the riches of Egypt, and, dying daily, to draw new and more blessed life from the fountain of Life Eternal.

But those troubles and difficulties which have a more external character may be glanced at in a less cursory manner. Those persons living in the world, who have given any attention to the subject, must have felt surprise at the fact that from S. Paul's time downwards, (Phil. iv. 2,) all writers have laid such a stress on Unity as a necessity of the Religious Life. It would seem to be such a simple matter of course, that, even in ordinary families, it should hardly need insisting on. But the members of families have been brought up together, have rubbed off each other's little peculiarities, or have learned how to avoid jarring against them. The Sisters of a Religious House come together, strange to one another, with full grown characters and individualities, and find it a very difficult matter to be always at peace. That they should be all modelled in the same exact proportions, would be as undesirable as it is impossible. Mind shows itself in manner, and many minds must develope many manners. And, differing from each other in age, education, country, nurture, and many other points of strong contrast, the inmates of a Religious House find continual occasion of temptation to misunderstanding and disagreement. Here the Rule comes in, subduing nature to grace. They are taught to pray daily for each other by name, and especially for any whom they regard with less affection; to bear all things, and give others nothing to bear; and the often recurring hours of silence impose a wholesome check on idle talking, or mischievous discussions.

Within the walls of a Sisterhood, women often also find temptations to petty jealousies and captious feelings, which, in the World, they would have scorned to entertain for a moment, but which now harass and vex them perpetually. The reason is not far to seek. They did not, could not, wholly lay aside their old selves when they assumed the religious dress; and Satan is only tempting them now with such materials as lie within reach, as he did beforetime in apparently greater matters. He learned their weak points long ago. In the sight of the invisible watchers about our path, there may be very slight difference between the heinousness of that jealous vanity which arrogates to itself the first place in an intellectual circle, or a county society, and that which is offended by a precedence unconsciously taken by a junior Sister in entering or leaving a room. Were the sphere of life wider, the temptations would be such as look greater, and less contemptible; as it is, though almost infinitely small, they are

none the less those "little foxes which spoil the grapes," and which none but our true Solomon can take out of our vineyards.

Morbidity is another danger, especially in this hysterical age. People who are destitute of keen feelings, are remarkably apt to give that name to any manifestation of more acute sensations than they themselves experience; and, saddening many a soul which God had not made sad, to adduce signs of morbidity in those who were guiltless of any such thing before it was laid to their charge. But whether it be caused by unkindness, or by natural temperament, she who is so afflicted, must show it no quarter when once she has discovered an enemy so treacherous and so formidable, always remembering, on the other hand, that, "if wounded feelings are a fountain of venial sins, they are also a capability of great holiness: they do not want killing; they want supernaturalizing." Good, hearty work, continual watchfulness to show little kindnesses to others, and to avoid brooding over self, are weapons which will generally be more than a match for the misery of morbidity.

These are a few of the difficulties in the Community Life of Sisters. But ascetic writers say that the most difficult point of all is the rendering obedience to Superiors when the thing commanded appears useless, injudicious, or silly. And if this were true in Mediæval times, when feudal traditions and ecclesiastical discipline were powerful supporters of obedience, much truer is it in this lawless age, whose characteristic is its contempt of rule and subjection. Here is the secret of many splits that take place in our religious bodies, and of the many new establishments set up with the intention of improving on all previous systems. Here lies the cause of much failure in the work, and much in the world. The founder of a new House must have exceeding faith, or extreme presumption; and those who rush ignorantly into such undertakings, can but prepare for themselves disappointment and disgrace. It is true that many Superiors and Chaplains of Religious Houses are, in this or that respect, injudicious, or even unfitted for the post they hold; but S. Paul inculcated obedience to the Emperor Nero: and unless absolute sin be involved, the children of such Houses ought to uphold their spiritual parents, and patiently wait for better days, and for the reward of obedience. On the other hand, individual responsibility is a thing which no reasonable being has power to lay aside; and it is as much the duty of a Sister to express herself simply and truly to her Superiors on any point of which she cannot take the same view that they do, as it is thereafter her duty to abide by their decision, and work out the orders given

with as much alacrity as if they were after the dictates of her own heart.

It is not easy to act in this manner. Superiors, whether religious or secular, can hardly see through the deceptive veil woven round them by their weak friends and foolish flatterers. Be their plans never so injudicious, they are sure to find favour in the sight of those who, ignoring their own responsibility, receive every emanation from high places as an embodiment of certain truth and wisdom; and in their sight also, who would sacrifice principle rather than utter disagreeable sentiments. Surrounded by this pliant crowd, those must appear to disadvantage who dare not be untrue, and, as Sisterhoods are still but human, must suffer for their truthfulness, though often without the slightest idea or intention on the part of the Superiors. But if such Sisters have strength to be true, they have also strength, if they will, to be loyal and patient; and they certainly do more for GOD'S glory by working on, quietly, for Him, amid cold looks and disgrace, than by striking out a new line for themselves, and beginning life afresh under new auspices.

Trials—troubles—temptations—difficulties on so many sides; is not this detail enough to discourage any one who may hitherto have herself intended to enter on the Religious Life? Why so? Sisters *must* have a harder battle to fight than secular persons who have made no such distinct profession of serving GOD in an especial manner. They go out to engage in a hand-to-hand conflict with Satan on his own ground. They have armour of proof—they are strengthened with the might of the LORD their GOD—but would it be a conflict at all, if they did not feel it to be such? Weak, and erring, and imperfect as they are, how should they not sometimes feel discouraged and perplexed, and all but utterly cast down? Satan brings all his choicest weapons into play against them, because his fear of them is no less deadly than his hate. If their dear LORD do but give them the grace of perseverance, all must be well. Their victories may seem puny indeed, both to themselves and to others: but they shall be more than conquerors through Him Who, loving His Own that are in the world, loveth them unto the end; through Him Who gives the crown not only to triumphant victors, but to those who for His sake have laboured, and have not fainted.

Thus, as to the misunderstandings to which allusion has been made—shall a brave woman shrink back from a Sister's Life, because she may meet with hard words and unjust dealing on the part of her Superior? Is she not rather to thank GOD and take courage, because she is counted worthy to partake their blessing

who for conscience toward GOD, endure grief, suffering wrongfully? Verily, YES.

And in these matters, and in most others connected with the Religious Life, every true Sister knows well that her great supports are, Confession, the Blessed Eucharist, and her three Vows. Confession—not its exaggeration, over-direction, but the legitimate use of the Sacrament—keeps her up to a high standard; helps her to rise when she has fallen; and braces her to do and dare like a noble Christian woman. Of the Blessed Sacrament, what can be said, but that it is her life, her light, her sanctification, the very Life of her life? The Vows—Poverty, Obedience, and Chastity—so freely stigmatized, because so thoroughly misunderstood, are, in their reality, a stay, a bulwark, and a comfort, for the want of which nothing else can make up.

As long as human nature continues to be what it is, so long will these various vexations and temptations harass, as they always have harassed, the Religious Life. The rulers will be tempted to be arbitrary; the ruled to be captious and jealous. But when egotism is cast down from its throne, all goes well, and no temptation has power to spoil or to destroy. Then, and then only, can the counsels of perfection be really carried out; then, and then only, is the Life truly religious, the foretaste of Paradise, and the pledge of Eternal Glory.

Now, to look at the daily routine of Sisterhood Life. You desire to become acquainted with it? Very well. Will you turn to that quiet cluster of houses, where church bells ring sweetly down from above, and the thunder of two great London thoroughfares is hardly deadened by distance? Or, near the banks of the Thames, will you visit that Conventual pile, with its lovely and religious chapel, which harbours so many penitent souls, cared for by Religious women? Or, threading lanes and alleys reeking with misery and crime, will you join the patient labourers in Wapping? Or, under towering elms, and through the quaint Sussex village, will you take your way to seek the nook so dear to him who, in a three-fold manner, wove a three-fold cord, and, parting to his rest, set the roots of his Sisterhood in the earth, and lifted its head to Paradise?

Well: take your choice. Whichever House you choose, you will find yourself in a new world as soon as you enter. A lay Sister, or an orphan, or in some cases the senior Sister then at home, opens the door, and the dress strikes you immediately. You have no objection to distinctive dress, or you would scarcely have come so far; and you will soon see plainly enough for

yourself how absolutely needful it is. Then, although there is a good thick door-mat, you see no vestige of carpet; the nearest approach to which is cocoa-nut matting, and there is not a great deal of that. The furniture and fittings are mostly of stained deal; so are the floors, unless they are left unstained, with no other adornment than frequent scrubbing. You must not speak on the stairs or in the passages; therefore follow, if you please, in silence, while you are led to your own room. It is small, you see, but large enough to turn about in, particularly as during your stay you will wear no crinoline. You have an iron bedstead, a mattress, and plenty of blankets, conveniences for washing, a press for clothes, a chair, and perhaps a table, and a piece of matting on the floor. On the walls are prints of religious subjects; possibly, also, illuminations, and some text painted as a cornice round the room. You will, if you please, wear a little net or muslin cap while you visit at this house, and if your dress is black or grey, so much the better. The Assistant-Superior will, after you have had time to rest, give you a time-table of your daily occupations; meanwhile, you will sit in the visitors' room, or, if an Associate of the House, in the Sisters' Community Room. Here you will find books and musical instruments; and conversation, except during the times of silence, which, recurring daily at stated hours, will soon cease to seem unnatural to you. Allusion has been made previously to this keeping of silence, and to one of its uses; and it will be worth while to revert to the subject, for its uses are manifold. It not only checks the act of idle talking, but also the disposition to indulge in it. It imparts fresh powers of self-control. You refrain from saying something perfectly harmless, because it is silence time; and then, when silence time has expired, you find yourself unexpectedly strengthened to keep back words which are not harmless. Silence braces the mind, and gives it habits of thoughtfulness and independence. It lightens many difficult labours by the degree of repose it imparts, and strengthens the defences and outworks of the soul.

You will now wish to become acquainted with the Chapel Services. Where Daily Prayers are said in the parish church, they are attended by the household, at least by such members of it as are not prevented by some sufficient cause from being present; but the Canonical Hours of Prayer are regularly observed in the chapel belonging to the House. The depth and beauty of these Offices will repay the pains and study which their complexity requires. The Psalter, repeated weekly, forms the basis on which is raised the structure of Antiphon, Hymn, Chapter,

and Response, varying with the seasons of the Church, and bringing out the deep things of Holy Scripture in an incomparable manner. The Use is partly that of Sarum, and partly Reformed Roman, with some necessary alterations; but to dwell on this subject as it deserves, would need a separate Essay.

Here is an easy time-table for your guidance:—

6	A.M.	Rise.
6.50	„	Office of Prime.
7	„	Celebration of Holy Eucharist.
8	„	Breakfast.
8.30	„	Make bed and dust room.
9	„	Office of Terce.
10—12	„	School.
12	NOON.	Office of Sexts, and Meditation in the Oratory.
1	P.M.	Dinner.
1.30—2.30	„	Recreation Hour.
2.30—3.10	„	Meditation in Oratory and Office of Nones.
3.10—5	„	Needlework or Study.
5	„	Office of Vespers.
5.30	„	Tea.
6—8.45	„	Needlework, or Night School, &c., followed by
7.15	„	Office of Compline, and
8.45	„	Supper.
9.15	„	Office of Anticipated Matins.
11	„	In bed.

This time-table gives a fair idea of an ordinary day's work. The occupations set down in it are school-teaching and needlework. Of the former mention will be made presently. Of the latter, it may be remarked that it is either plain work for the use of the House, or Church embroidery, of which a great quantity is now executed by English Sisters. The Oratory Services, recurring at such frequent intervals, are brief, with the exception of the Celebration, Vespers, and Matins, each of which occupies half an hour, more or less; but the hour from noon to one o'clock is set apart for private prayer and meditation in the Oratory, and forms a welcome breathing space in the midst of the day. Half an hour more is set apart at another time for a like purpose. Meals, in some Houses, are taken in silence; in some, conversation is allowed and encouraged; in others, a book is read aloud during dinner-time. In Recreation time, the Sisters are expected to assemble together, and the Mother, or, in her absence, the Assistant-Superior, joins the party.

And, as at certain times silence is held to be necessary and profitable, so now it is to be remembered that cheerfulness and liveliness are the duties of every Sister. Entering from the world into this company, you can hardly fail to perceive a peculiar atmosphere of placidity and simplicity; not at all produced by inanity, but rather by the cheerful confidence of children in their FATHER'S Home. In like manner you will probably be struck by the sunny faces and open demeanour of the children in the Orphanage, as contrasted with the appearance of those of the same class in ordinary institutions and under secular government.

It may here be observed, that the education imparted in Sisterhoods is sometimes less brilliant than that obtained in ordinary schools; but the children are trained in good and holy habits, and as they one by one go out into the world, they leave not a harsh school, and hard taskmasters, but a home, to which they gladly return on their occasional holidays, and loving friends to whom they continue to turn in all their various joys and troubles of their lives. Sometimes, instead of going out to service, or after having done so for a time, those who have been trained in the House, request to be received as Serving-Sisters, and become valuable members of the Sisterhood which had so incalculably befriended them. Serving-Sisters, or Lay-Sisters, as they are sometimes called, have no vote in the government of the Establishment, but are elected in the same manner and under the same rule as Choir-Sisters; on which subject it will be well now to speak.

There is a wild idea prevalent that Sisterhoods are formed by hungry Priests and ambitious Superiors, eager to get unwary, (especially if wealthy) young women within their grasp, to pervert them, rule them with a rod of iron, and make them wretched for life. Far from it. It is no easy matter to obtain entrance into a Sisterhood. A woman may have a sincere desire for the life, be well adapted for it, and perhaps have a good fortune to bring with her; and yet may be rejected, on offering herself for the Noviciate. If received then, she may be rejected when proposed for Profession; and, though she pass through that ordeal, she may, in some Houses, at any future time be requested to leave the Sisterhood, should it appear desirable to a majority of three-fourths of the Sisters. This precarious state of things is very different from the popular idea of the case; but also it is very much more true.

A person offering herself for a Sister's Life, is, as has been already seen, admitted as a Postulant; entering on no engagement; merely residing in the House for a longer or shorter time, perform-

ing work assigned her, and keeping the Rule. She is thus enabled to form some clearer idea as to her own fitness for becoming a permanent inmate of the Institution, and the Superior and professed Sisters have an opportunity of judging whether or not to permit her election as a Novice. The rule for admission to this degree varies in different Houses. In one it may rest with the Superior to admit or reject; in another, it depends on a majority of votes, given in Chapter by the Professed Sisters. The period of the Noviciate varies also. It is the seed time of the Sister's life; and those who enter on it are placed under the charge of a Mistress of Novices. Her duties are very fairly parallel to those performed by a College Tutor towards the Undergraduates; and they are, as S. Francis de Sales has told us, of the greatest importance. She grounds her children in the knowledge necessary for their future life: she shows them its difficulties and dangers, that they may not blindly take irrevocable vows upon themselves: she teaches them to test their own vocations, and search and see whether or not they have been deceiving themselves in this matter: she instructs them in the living spirit, not the dead letter, of their new obligations, present or future. To those who need it, and there are few who do not, she gives a long and patient course of elementary theology; she teaches how to meditate, how to teach and help the young, the old, the sick, the fallen; she studies the characters of her charges, and directs the course of their spiritual teaching according to their different needs. If a Novice be possessed of any peculiar talent, she shows her in what way best to consecrate it to her Master's service. If the education of another has been neglected, she teaches her how to improve in writing, or it may be, in spelling, because those things are not matters of little moment. The Mistress of the Novices is bound to spend and be spent in doing every thing that lies in her power to enable her children to glorify God and serve Him to the best of their abilities: and as those abilities are often lying dormant, it is her part and duty to educe them, as best she may.

Having passed through the time of probation, which varies from one year to two or three, the Novice, if she still desire to dedicate herself to the Religious Life, may be proposed for election as a Professed Sister. According as the Rule of the House requires, she is either elected by a bare majority, or by a majority of two-thirds; but, in one Order, at least, the election does not take place if the Novice is not considered eligible by the Chaplain, the Superior, the Assistant-Superior, and the Mistress of the Novices, or by a majority of them. At her profession, for the

first and only time, the new Sister takes those Vows whose spirit she learned during her Noviciate, and which bind her to the Religious Life for ever. Of course she may visit, or be visited by, her relations and friends, according to the regulations of the House, but she can never again return to an ordinary life in the World. After her profession, a Sister is not bound to remain for life, however, in the same Sisterhood. She is free, it is believed, in all Orders, to leave at any moment. The Religious Life she *cannot* leave; any particular Religious House she may. And, if she so please, she may continue in the position of a Novice to her life's end, taking no life Vows upon herself, and prevented by no bond from returning to the World, from whence she came out—that is, if her heart will allow her to return.

The Sisters in each Community take precedence of one another according to the time of their several receptions—of course excepting the Mother-Superior, and her Assistant, who take the lead. The other principal offices in the House give no rank to the Sisters holding them: they are those of Mistress of the Novices, Head of the Orphanage, Keeper of the Wardrobe, Sacristan, &c. Sisters in charge of works at a distance from the parent House are styled Sisters Superior, and are bound as strictly by the Rule as those Sisters who remain at home, though, in indifferent matters, they are of course expected and intended to act for themselves, to the best of their abilities.

Concerning the constitution of our Religious Houses it has been wisely said:—"Whereas the English mind submits willingly and loyally to law, but is averse, by habit and principle, from arbitrary personal rule, therefore a modern Sisterhood or Brotherhood should be governed chiefly by a code of fixed rules agreed upon by the whole community, and as little as possible should be left to the mere authority or caprice of the Superior. The Superior should be an example to the rest of obedience to the Rules of the House, and not lord or mistress over them." And all well-organized Sisterhoods have been founded on a firm basis of well-digested laws, which, though necessarily modified in some particulars, are in substance identical with the rules of S. Benedict, S. Augustine, and other Fathers of the ascetic life.

In some Houses, the Superior governs alone, kept in check by the Rule only. In others, the government is constitutional, and is vested in the body of Professed Sisters, who are called upon to give their votes or their opinions in Chapter. The Chapter is usually convened by the Chaplain or the Superior, and is composed of as large a number of Professed Sisters as can be assembled, the votes of the absent Sisters being sent for. By

this conclave are decided the elections of Chaplains, Superiors, Professed and Serving Sisters; and, in some Houses, also of Novices; also, any points concerning the constitution of the House, and all matters sensibly affecting its finances, as, for instance, the undertaking of any new and expensive branch work.

Of the duties of the Mother-Superior it may be said:—She is to be Superior, ordering the daily routine of the House, watching and labouring for its welfare, and enforcing the observance of the Rule on the community, and firstly on herself; and she is to be Mother, the true Mother, of all her children, spending herself for them and for their welfare, without reserve or partiality. The Superior is sometimes elected for life, sometimes triennially. The latter method has, amongst others, the advantage of educating a staff of Sisters, in readiness to undertake the charge of Branch Houses; and also gives scope for the practice of humility on the part of those who, having been Superiors, return to their own undistinguished place among their Sisters. A past Superior may be and frequently is re-elected.

The Assistant-Superior is elected, as the Rule may be, by the Sisters, or chosen by the Mother, and her duties are implied in her name.

It may readily be conceived that the post of Superior is one which it is most difficult to fill, especially at the present time. A country long lulled in the arms of peace, without even the semblance of a standing army, must needs be ill-prepared when at last she rises to make head against the insidious enemy which has been stealthily encroaching on her borders during the time of her fancied security. And so it is with us now. Our leaders may indeed be up and doing; they may be zealous, able, and persevering; but it is impossible that they should not make some mistakes, and the only wonder is that they make so few.

And of all leaders in the Catholic movement, the heads of our Sisterhoods ought to be, as they are not, the most leniently judged. And this for several reasons. Although it is true that in early mediæval times seculars might be appointed the Superiors of Religious Houses, yet the preponderance of rule and practice has always pointed to the choice of those already well accustomed to the discipline and duties of the life. Save in very exceptional cases, she cannot rule rightly who has never learnt to obey thoroughly. But any such training has, from the very exigencies of the case, been impossible to most of our Superiors.

Again:—consider the motley assemblage over whom they are to bear rule; and here reference is more especially made to recent

foundations, in which little help can be afforded her by any assistants—all being equally inexperienced. See the variety of characters, untamed and undisciplined, despondent and broken, spirited, discontented, ambitious, retiring, turbulent, timid—these dispositions, and many more, not in embryo, as in a school of children, but well defined and pronounced: how is the Superior, herself new to the work, to deal with them all, without making mistakes with regard to some?

"Ye have not passed this way heretofore." It will be comparatively easy for another generation to do great things where we are slowly and with difficulty making small beginnings. Sisterhoods will be under regularly established Rule, probably under Episcopal superintendence. Misunderstandings will be removed, and hindrances will be set aside, and the system will be acknowledged as the great means whereby Woman's Work is to be done in the Church of CHRIST. But to the Women of our own day is given the nobler part, to be the first to pass that way, to bear the brunt of the battle, to gain for those that shall come after them a place and a name, and to suffer all the suffering which a Sister's Life now involves.

"Show Thy servants Thy work, and their children Thy glory. And the glorious Majesty of the LORD our GOD be upon us: prosper Thou the work of our hands upon us: O prosper Thou our handy-work."

"Show Thy servants Thy work." And it would be ungrateful not to acknowledge how abundantly already Almighty GOD has shown His work to these His servants. The Priest who, some ten or eleven years ago, invited his recently-formed band of Sisters to set apart a day for prayer that they might have the opportunity of serving GOD which they desired, and which man refused them, has now seen their multiplied numbers utterly insufficient for the various labours to which they have been called through the length and breadth of the country; has seen their thoroughly tangible work commend itself to men of all creeds and of none; and has lain down to die, soothed and comforted by those very ministrations which his own noble heart had devised for the good of others, and for which the blessing of them that were ready to perish came upon him and upon his nursing Sisters. From Falmouth to Aberdeen, from Liverpool to Folkestone, our Sisterhoods have spread.

Taking them in the order of their establishment, Miss Sellon's Society ranks first. The permanent House at Devonport has sent out branches to London (where her Sisters have worked

chiefly in Spitalfields and in the district of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square), to Falmouth, Carnmenellis, Plymouth, Ascot, and half across the globe to Honolulu, in the Sandwich Islands.

Then comes the Sisterhood of S. John Baptist, at Clewer, near Windsor, now in the eighteenth year of its existence, and numbering about sixty Sisters in its three divisions. No Institution of the same description has ramified more extensively through this country. It has charge of a Mission in the parish of Soho, and of two or three works in the same neighbourhood, besides an Orphanage and a large School for young ladies in Pimlico, a Sanatorium at Folkestone, and Houses of Mercy at Bovey Tracey, Devonshire, and at Oxford. The latest offshoot which the parent stem has put forth is in the direction of the parish of S. Alban the Martyr, Holborn; though this good work is only now in course of being organized. But its greatest and fullest work is done at Clewer itself; in its district visiting, its Orphanage, its Convalescent Homes, and, above all, its Penitentiary. In this last sphere of labour Clewer has nobly helped to win from a slowly assenting public the confession that incomparable success attends the patient persevering efforts of unpaid and self-devoted women.

Of the larger English Sisterhoods, All Saints', Margaret Street, stands next in age. It contains at present upwards of forty Sisters. And let it be observed, how much larger are these numbers than are generally to be met with in foreign Houses. Some large old foundations, indeed, have their sixty or seventy Sisters; but these are very few and far between; and the greater majority can count no more than eight, or ten, or twelve.

The All Saints' Sisters have a great work to do, and they do it. What it is to labour day and night, night and day, among the miserable population, part infidel, part heathen, of the courts and purlieus behind our great London streets, few have hitherto cared to know: but the Sisters of All Saints' know well. And so do those others who have so long worked in Seven Dials and in Ratcliffe Highway, in Lambeth, in Clerkenwell, in Pimlico, and in Limehouse; where also, be it observed, they *could not* work without a distinctive dress. In places which few other women could enter without insult, the Sister's habit is at once her recommendation and her safe-guard.

Besides their work in the district surrounding the Home, the Sisters of All Saints' have charge of the nursing in University College Hospital, and also in the Chorlton Union Workhouse, at Manchester. They have also their own Convalescent Hospitals at Eastbourne, and Harlow, and a Mission in the district of S.

Mary's, Soho: not to mention the Orphanage, Asylum for Aged Women, Industrial School for training Girls for service, and Home for Incurables, &c.; which are under the roof of or closely contiguous to All Saints' Home itself.

Next we come to S. Margaret's, East Grinstead, which notwithstanding the various labours of charity that it has since undertaken, has perseveringly and successfully carried on the work of cottage nursing, which it was the first to attempt in this, or any country; and its unique nature demands some notice. Quoting from an account drawn up a few years since:—"First consider what an experiment it is. A body of women, ladies or otherwise, able and willing to go out, singly or by twos, into any village or town in the kingdom, to minister to the poor—efficient in the art of nursing others and denying themselves—ready to live in the humblest cottage, with the roughest people, in the roughest way—ready to turn their hands to any thing and every thing. Where shall such a body of women be found? 'Nowhere,' it was said, in England, 'nowhere will ladies expose themselves to the rudeness and coarseness of an ordinary cottage; nor would the peasant class of our countrymen accept such service; they would shrink from it with awkward shyness, and infinitely prefer the good offices of nurses of their own rank.' 'Impossible,' it was said by foreigners again, 'impossible to *you*, though possible in itself, to *us*; extremely difficult—the work of uncommon grace—grace which can be had in the true Church, and therefore may be possessed by us. In your Communion you cannot have the requisite grace, and you will fail.' We thankfully admit that nothing but the special Grace of God can bring such a work as this to success. But it has been brought to success in S. Margaret's Home, because the Grace of God has been poured out upon it: and that Home is the work of the English Church." So far a writer in an early number of the *Church Review*.

Concerning the need for such work, take the following words from a very different pen:—"Oh, for a good spirit who would take the housetops off, with a more potent and benignant hand than the lame demon in the tale, and show a Christian people what dark shapes issue from amidst their homes, to swell the retinue of the destroying angel as he moves forth among them! For only one night's view of the pale phantoms rising from the scenes of our too long neglect; and, from the thick and sullen air where vice and fever propagate together, raining the tremendous social retributions which are ever pouring down, and ever coming thicker! Bright and blest the

morning that should rise on such a night: for men, delayed no more by stumbling-blocks of their own making, which are but spectres of death upon the path between them and eternity, would then apply themselves, like creatures of one common origin, owing one duty to the FATHER of one Family, and tending to one common end, to make the world a better place!"

Time and space would fail to speak of the many other Sisterhoods scattered through the country: of the solid, wholesome work done at S. Mary's, Brighton; of the successful attempts at S. James' and S. Martin's, in Puritan Liverpool; of the Houses of Mercy at Horbury, Ditchingham, Wantage, Bedminster, and Bussage; of S. Lucy's, at Gloucester; S. Mary's at Dorking; S. John's, at Frome Selwood; S. Thomas', at Oxford; S. Peter's, Brompton; S. Peter's, Vauxhall; S. Mary's, Wymering; and of the long and patient and blessed labours of the Sisters of S. George's Mission. An outline of the intentions and work of these several Religious Houses, with some interesting details, may be found in *A Kalendar of the English Church for the year* 1867 (Church Press Company).

After all, that which can be told about any of these houses is only the least part. There is infinitely more which never can be told, until the day when all such things shall be revealed, and it shall be made manifest how such and such a work, which seemed so fruitless, has brought forth abundantly; how such and such a word, which seemed thrown away, has been the saving of a soul; how patience and endurance, apparently spent on thankless objects, have their rewards in the salvation of immortal beings and in the glory of GOD. Then it will be seen how the unconscious influence of a Sister's daily, consistent, humble life has acted on those about her; how, "a burning *and* a shining light," she spent herself for her LORD, and others, seeing her good works, glorified her FATHER Which is in Heaven. There will be no word of blame then for enthusiastic love of GOD, for self-forgetfulness, and for holy life.

To look forward to that bright day might be enough to make the crooked straight, and the rough places plain; or at least to cause the pilgrim's feet to take little heed of the difficulties of the way. But there are other and nearer comforts and solaces in a Sister's Life. The Blessed Sacrament, full of grace to all, comes to her with special fulness of benediction. It is only in accordance with our LORD'S dealings that it should be so. He pays us dazzlingly, even in this world, for any little sacrifice which by His grace we offer unto Him. Whatever a Sister has

relinquished for His sake, whatever, for His sake, she must endure, He more than makes up for it all. For is it not His own blessed promise that, "He shall receive an hundredfold now in this time with persecutions: and in the world to come eternal life?" Concerning such matters, words are faint shadows, almost mockeries, of the unspeakable, ineffable depths of truth and love of which they feebly stammer; and there are none which can express the utter peace and peaceful trust, and trusting love with which the faithful Sister, in the midst of turmoil, brings her weary burden to her dear LORD, and lays it at His sacred feet, or learns of Him how best to bear it.

Let some lines from a sermon on the text—"As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing," preached in a Sisterhood, bring this subject and this Essay to a close. "Dear Sisters, you would be here to very little purpose, your crosses would be a mere useless ornament, your dresses would be a mockery, unless you knew and felt at once what is the ground and source of this *always joy*. It is because the one aim of your life is always to be—to be, if it may be so, sensibly—with Him Whom you love. . . . Look each of you to the time when you have felt most comfort and happiness and nearness to GOD here, and then judge if that same feeling could be yours always would it not be indeed *alway rejoicing!* Oh, dear Sisters, how cruelly they misjudge us, how little they know of our real heart's desires, who would make our faith a faith of forms, a faith of having, of leaning on, or trusting to any thing else than that one most dear and most precious Name! All we want to do is to be close to Him. I think we should answer with the Church's greatest Doctor—'Thou hast written well concerning Me, Thomas: what wilt thou have therefore?' 'LORD, I desire nothing except THYSELF.'"

Private Confession and Absolution.

Boswell: "Confession?" *Johnson:* "Well, I don't know but that it is a good thing. The Scripture says, 'Confess your sins one to another,' and the priests confess as well as the laity. Then it must be considered that their absolution is only upon repentance, and often upon penance also. You think your sins may be forgiven without penance, upon repentance alone."

Few subjects are less understood by the English public than that of Private Confession and Absolution; and accordingly few subjects are oftener disposed of by sheer prejudice and passion. If you listen to one of the more determined opponents of this Sacrament, you hear it denounced as this 'auricular' Confession, as if Confession could be any thing but auricular: or as this 'private' Confession, as if the objector had a preference for Confession of sins in public and before the congregation: or as being often abused and prostituted to bad purposes, as if nothing else in religion were liable to the same misadventure: or as exaggerating and exalting priestly authority, as if the Holy Eucharist were not chargeable with like dangers: or as exposing all concerned to the peril of impurities and defilements, as if any kind of cleansing or healing could be undertaken without incurring such risks: or as being unscriptural, as though we were not told in Holy Scripture to confess our sins one to another. In our days some, who do not entirely abandon the practice inculcated by the English Prayer Book, take exception to Confession as being in their opinion Sacramental and Ritualistic, as though they would reduce the spiritual intercourse between the priest and penitent to the level of ordinary conversation, and deprive it of the external decency and order, with which every thing in religion should be done.

Nor is this all: the minds of men are poisoned by such misrepresentations as that the difference between the Churches of Rome and England consists in the entire prohibition or discountenancing of Confession by the latter: that the Fathers of the English Reformation and the best divines of the English Church were against all Private Confession: and that the Church of England, if she seems to sanction any thing of the kind, has in this respect deferred too much to the feelings and prejudices of people when emerging out of the corruptions of a dark age. And as if all this were not enough to render confusion worse con-

founded, there are not wanting persons who endeavour to maintain on Patristic grounds that Private Confession ought to be abolished.

Thus, as not unfrequently happens in other controversies of the day, English Priests find themselves confronted with the prejudices of the ignorant, and the convictions of the learned, and with the charge of unfaithfulness to the English Church in advocating the use of Private Confession and Absolution.

It would be well, however, to put before a dispassionate and reflecting mind, how it has come to pass that Private Confession has been revived to such an extent as it is in the English Church. And here, to remove some common misconceptions, no one, I imagine, supposes that, with the exception of a few morbid minds, persons can take pleasure in making a Confession of their sins. It may be a relief in the end, like the extracting of a tooth or the amputation of a limb, but all naturally shrink from the operation. True it is that Private Confession is not now followed by Public Confession and Public Penance, as was the case in the early Church; yet, though the pain is less, it is still sufficient to deter many from opening their griefs till the burden has become indeed intolerable. Shame is as repulsive to the soul as pain is to the body. Nothing but the feeling of stern necessity, or the experience of beneficial results in either case makes the penitent to balance one instinct with another, and yield to that which preponderates. Nor can any one, I also imagine, suppose that it can be any pleasure to even a man of low organization, to have to hear under the seal of Confession the weaknesses and scandals which beset poor human nature in even its regenerate form. In fact nothing but a very earnest struggle for sanctification can enable a priest to endure what else would be tedious, wearisome, and oftentimes disgusting beyond expression. Confession must satisfy some real wants in man's moral nature, or he would not seek for himself nor bestow charitably on others what can only be obtained and afforded in spite of all the obstacles which lie in the way of demand and supply.

And we must not forget that even outside of the Church, wherever religion has been deepened in earnestness, Confession has found a place amongst spiritual helps. Confession and Absolution are not, and cannot be universally co-extensive ideas in the modern religious mind. And hence Confession has been the expression of the burdened soul even where there was no possible Ministry of Absolution. Even the mediæval view seems to consent to this:—"If thou want a priest, thou must make thy

confession to thy neighbour or to thy fellow" (Peter Lomb. iv. 17). Yet so rooted was the desire of Absolution that it is said (Corp. Jur. Can. *Decret.* Greg. IX. i. tit. xxxi. Gloss. in cap. 11) —"In case of necessity a layman may hear confessions and absolve." Lanfranc (*De Celand. Conf.*) applies Num. xix. 14—19, "the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean," to lay confessors in default of clerical. Lay absolution thus seems to have taken a place with lay baptism in the hour of need. Nor is this so extreme a notion as might be imagined, when we consider that S. Cyprian (*Ep.* xviii.) allowed Deacons in such a case to hear the confession, and reconcile the departing with imposition of hands. With the loss of the Episcopal succession, all thought of the Ministry of Absolution ceased, but not all desire of Confession. On the other hand, the last outpouring of the Chevalier Bayard, when he looked around in the battle-field in vain for a priest, and in default thereof bade his esquire hold up the hilt of his sword for a cross and hear his dying confession, is but a sample of the way in which men accustomed in the middle ages to disburthen their souls of their griefs for lack of clergy betook themselves to lay ears.

It was this abiding feeling, in spite of the loss of Absolution, which led Luther to retain Confession, concerning which he expresses himself in his usual nervous language, saying that "he would rather lose a thousand worlds, than suffer private Confession to be thrust out of the Church." Calvin similarly bids "every faithful man remember that it is his duty (if inwardly he be vexed and afflicted with the sense of his sins) not to neglect that remedy, which is offered him by the Lord, to wit, that (for the easing of his conscience) he make private Confession of his sins unto his pastor." And as those who separated themselves from the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century retained a high esteem for private Confession, so has it been in use amongst dissenters of later date. Amongst the Wesleyan Methodists it assumes the form of "experiences" in the class-meeting: and amongst the Moravians of "giving an account of the heart's course." Mrs. Schimmelpenninck says that it is included in the confidence existing between mothers and children amongst the Quakers [1]. Jacob Abbott opens his *Young Christian* with the argument that Confession to others restores peace of mind, and closes it with a dissertation on its tendency to promote reformation:—"The first step to break the chains of any sinful habit," he says, "is to confess it fully and freely. That single act will

[1] "I poured out my mind to her as in the presence of God, or as a Catholic to his Confessor, to tell her of my faults."—*Life of M. A. Schimmelpenninck.*

do more to give your fault its deathblow than almost any thing else you can do. If you are a child, you can derive great assistance from confessing to your parents. Or confess and express your determination to amend to some confidential friend of your own age." And if we needed the testimony of one of the old Evangelical party to demonstrate that Confession is in theory and practice common to all deep religious impressions, we might quote that of Richard Cecil:—"Professional men—a minister, a lawyer, a medical man—have an official secrecy imposed on them. If this were not the case, a distressed conscience could never unburthen itself to its confessors. Incalculable injuries to health and property must be sustained for want of proper advisers. This applies in a very high sense to a minister, considered as a confessor, a director of the conscience. An alarmed conscience will unfold its most interior recesses to him. It is said that Dr. Owen (a Presbyterian) advised a man who, under religious convictions, confessed to him a murder which he had perpetrated some years before, to surrender himself to justice. The man did so, and was executed. I think Dr. Owen erred in his advice. I thought myself right, in urging on persons, who have opened their hearts to me, deep humiliation before God for crimes committed in an unconverted state; but as it had pleased Him to give a thorough hatred of those crimes to the mind, and a consequent self-loathing and humiliation, and yet to allow in His providence that they should have remained undiscovered, I judged that the matter might be safely left with Him."

Here then was one difficulty in the revival of Confession smoothed away. If we asked ourselves at the outset, Is Private Confession in accordance with Protestant principles? we found that all Protestants of every earnest school of thought had endorsed it as compatible with separation from the Catholic Church. It met an universal want, or we should not have found the Protestant standards of the sixteenth century emblazoned with such a motto as this—"Diligenter retinemus in Ecclesiæ Confessionem." It is not wonderful then that in the outset we should have put away, so far as concerns Private Confession, what Doctor Nathaniel Marshall, in the preface to his *Penitential Discipline*, called in 1714 "the stale and putrid imputation of Popery:" since all Evangelical Protestantism, which was not purely of a negative character, endorsed the theory and practice of confessing sins to a pastor or minister.

It has been said that Private Confession stands upon a separate pedestal, and does not necessarily include the idea of Absolution.

Yet Protestants abroad, in the early stage of their separation from the Catholic Church, maintained the necessity of Absolution also. Both the Augustan and Saxon Confessions of Faith affirm that "the rite of Private Absolution" ought to be retained in the Churches. And so Melancthon, with all his mildness, speaks strongly enough on the point when he declares that "it would be an act of impiety to take away Private Absolution from the Church." Whatever the Swiss or French Reformed may have done to depose Absolution from Confession, it is quite clear that Lutheranism has always maintained the connexion between them. It is perfectly astounding to find Private Confession and Absolution taught openly by authority in Lutheran communities, to an extent that until lately would have subjected the Anglican Priest to a pillory in the *Times*, and, unless beneficed, to suspension by his Bishop.

There was then an irresistible prejudication, not only in regard to Private Confession, but even in regard to Private Absolution, that there was nothing in Protestant principles in the abstract, which could preclude the possibility of practising both Confession and Absolution in the English Church. There was indeed a strange diversity between Helvetian and Lutheran teaching on this head, but it was the same in other doctrinal and practical cases. As Lutheranism held closely to the literal meaning of Holy Scripture in regard to Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, so it did in regard to the Power of the Keys. Calvinism, on the contrary, explained away Holy Scripture in reference to all these points. And the fact that Lutheranism, though equally with Calvinism or Zuinglianism or Socinianism denuded of authority by reason of losing the Apostolic Succession, yet has clung to the traditional signification of Holy Scripture in regard to Confession and Absolution, and not dared to lend itself to a system which would make the Word of God of null effect, was too striking a spectacle to allow thoughtful men in a communion like the English, which still claims the name of Catholic and Apostolic, to take up a position of a lower character than that maintained by German Protestants [1].

[1] See the *Evangelical Liturgy*, Stuttgart, 1858, p. 325, on Private Confession, quoted by Mr. Carter (*Doctrine of Confession*, pp. 88—90). Simple people are therein taught to Confess—Confession being defined, as Confession of one's sins, with readiness to receive the Absolution or pardon from the Confessor as from God Himself, not doubting but surely believing that sin is thereby forgiven by God Himself in Heaven. The difference between Confession to God and to the Confessor is defined as being that we confess to the latter only such sins as we are conscious of having committed, whether we have been impure, &c. After having asked for instruction how to confess in

It is however obvious that the two ideas, one resulting from the natural abhorrence of the shame arising from exposing our secret faults to a fellow-creature, and the other founded on a prejudice, however absurd, that it was contrary to the principles of the Protestant religion to do so, would be quite sufficient to hinder the revival of Confession, unless some very strong current of thought set in to counteract them. Such a counterbalancing force arose gradually out of restoring belief of the One Baptism for the remission of sins, and of the momentous consequences of regeneration. All the more that baptismal privileges and responsibilities were insisted upon, all the more awful that sin after baptism was depicted to be, all the more that Christian repentance was intensified and heightened, or represented as difficult and rare, all the stronger became the desire for availing oneself of some second baptism, some plank in our shipwreck, something tangible and sure, on which we might again extricate ourselves from the surging waves of a sinful world. But for this, it was seen that baptism was to the sinner an alarming truth and no more: and that thus the heresy of Novatian was near being recalled to life, whereby, as S. Cyprian (*Ep.* lv. *Oxf. Tr.*) says, people were exhorted to penitence for amends, while all healing power was taken away from the amends. In such a state of doctrinal imperfection it was evident that, as the same Father urged, great loss would ensue to souls. "Who would not forthwith perish? Who would not through very desperation fall away? Who would not divert his mind from all purpose of sorrowing?" In short it was felt that if the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration were not balanced by the doctrine of Absolution, so that "peace might be granted by God's priests," "repentance itself would be taken away," when "the fruit of repentance was not bestowed on them that mourned." Therefore it was concluded with S. Cyprian that "because there is no Confession in the grave, and the course of Confession cannot take place there, they who from their whole hearts repent and entreat ought to be received within the Church." The sinner who looked back on his Baptism with satisfaction, because he had been therein assured of pardon and cleansing, naturally yearned for a similar assurance,

a brief way, the person says to the Father Confessor, "I beg you will hear my Confession and give me Absolution of my sins." Then follows the preface, "I confess to God and to you, &c." "I beseech you to pronounce upon me the pardon of my sins;" and then the Private Confession. Whereupon the Confessor asks, "Dost thou believe that my pardon is God's pardon?" And after the reply, "Yes, I believe it is," the Confessor absolves in the authoritative first-person manner, as in our Visitation Office.

apart from his own feelings and emotions, that sins incurred by him since his Baptism were forgiven. And this yearning grew more and more, as the Holy Eucharist was more frequently celebrated, and people were exhorted to communicate more incessantly. From the moment that consciences became more enlightened, and their owners became more timorous and scrupulous, lest they should communicate with insufficient penitence, and run the risk of eating and drinking unworthily, and so of becoming guilty of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, Absolution became more and more a necessity. Nor only so, it became a consequence of all efforts to deepen and enlarge the inner life. Old habits of sin and even old sins presented to the penitent ties and bonds from which he desired to be loosed and let go more free. Men began to look at the path to eternal life more earnestly and seriously, and to question with themselves the safety of acting, as they would not do in any sublunary case of importance, without advisers and counsellors. To know ourselves thoroughly was acknowledged on all hands to be no easily acquired science. And seeing that most persons were very ready to claim plenary absolution for their sins without having acquired the proper dispositions, it seemed dangerous to trust to our own skill in difficult cases of conscience.

Moreover, as the Church has not merely restoration in view, but also preservation, the younger members were necessarily to be trained in the exercise of daily self-examination, in order to avoid deadly sin, as the older members needed to deal no less strictly with themselves in order to regain the strength and power of resistance, which had become enervated by past lapses. Regular self-examination disclosed the existence of evil, else often unsuspected by the young. The parish priest became naturally anxious that his catechumens for Baptism and his candidates for Confirmation should know what their besetting fault was. He became more solicitous that they should know themselves, than know the names of the Patriarchs, or of Moses' father and mother, or of the kings of Israel and Judah [1]. As each soul in its tender age still retained the germs of sin, it was needful that it should be alive to its own special peril, and know how far evil had developed itself within it. And what was true of the young in general, was felt to be no less so of the uneducated. Such persons mistook their dangers: they were often scrupulous and

[1] It is a question for serious thought, whether any appreciable number of candidates presented for Confirmation have really received any instruction whatever as to the management of their own consciences, or have even been asked whether they had any grievous sin burdening their souls.

unscrupulous in turn, to the great loss of their souls. No wonder that the parish priest who had arrived at the persuasion that his flock had become partakers of the Divine nature in their Baptism should see in all this an absolute necessity that greater freedom of intercourse should be maintained between himself and his people than is usual between Rector and cottager.

When once the doctrine had taken root, that the management of conscience was a science, the priest felt that he must open, as it were, a school of moral theology, as well as lecture upon the geography and history of Palestine. But the result of enlightening the soul as to its spiritual condition was often to reveal the wound which sin had inflicted. Not to heal as well as to instruct, was to go back to the Pre-Incarnation period of the Prophetical dispensation, when mankind were only shown their need of a SAVIOUR, though the time of His Advent had not yet arrived. Hence opportunities were afforded for Confession and Absolution. The parish priest no longer shut himself up in his study, nor confined his pastoral theology to the cottage wash-tub, but tarried behind in his vestry after services, that such as needed holy counsel and advice might come to him without difficulty and without observation.

And the benefit to the pastor and his flock derived therefrom became singularly marked. There he learned to deal with individual souls: there he learned to map out, as it were, the human soul, with its rocks and reefs, its shoals and breakers: there he learned the need of greater holiness for himself: there he gained a store for his sermons in the increased knowledge of the spiritual life and of the soul's trials: there he acquired the love of a father, the skill of a physician, the acuteness of a judge, and the wisdom of a theologian: there, in short, was the priest perfected as a man of GOD, thoroughly unto all good works. The holy life of a priest, said George Herbert, is his best "library," but that priest's library was found to be most abounding in useful theology, which was filled with the tomes of the souls of his people.

It is almost needless to say that as sermons became more real and life-like, the need of Confession became more increasing and permanent. So long as the old High Church party discouraged preaching and hymnology, there was but little stirring amongst the dry bones of the English Church; but when its new phase was joined by secessions from the Evangelical party, stirring hymns and sermons became a striking feature in the movement, and the necessity of conversion was much insisted upon. Priests were no longer content with scattering doctrine broadcast: they wanted to know what effect was produced by their sermons on

individual souls. Sermons ceased to be valued, except the preacher could have hope thereby of influencing some soul for eternity. Sermons began to be written or prepared by the preacher on his knees, rather than in his easy chair. The pulpit was thenceforth only a stepping-stone to the Confessional. And this, let us remember, was the consequence of the amalgamation between the High Church and Low Church movement. Where these streams still flow on apart, sermons are still sown broadcast, without any expectation of influencing individual souls, or if with such an expectation, it is seldom or never realized. It is an attempt, as Hammond has observed in his eulogy on Confession, to fill narrow-mouthed bottles by setting them together and throwing never so many buckets of water on them.

But with all these ample and sufficient justifications for the revival of Confession and Absolution in connexion with the acknowledged failures of the High Church or Low Church movements in the past, the question necessarily arose—Is this the Church's way? Does the English Church authorize and sanction this way of dealing with souls?

And the reply to this question was very easy. In the English Church were two orders of the Christian ministry—the Priesthood and the Diaconate. Both Priests and Deacons were Ministers of God, both usually commissioned to preach the Word of God, and in such wise to exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation. But Priests alone were empowered to pronounce Absolution and Remission of sins, just as they alone were sent forth to consecrate the Eucharistic elements. Unto the Priest alone at his Ordination was it said—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whosesoever sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." And accordingly the Priest alone was directed to move the sick or dying to make a special Confession of his sins, and to absolve him, if properly disposed, in the most authoritative and pronounced form, which has ever been in use throughout Christendom. Men naturally asked themselves—"Why, if preaching were all that Priest or Deacon could do in the way of remission of sins, should the Church have two Orders of ministers to do one and the selfsame thing? If remission signified only preaching, why was not this made plain in the Ordering of Priests? And why was Absolution confided to the Priest and not to the Deacon? And why was the Priest directed to absolve the sick penitent in terms so explicit and full, as precluded the possibility of confounding the preacher

with the absolver, or of such an interpretation of Absolution as was propounded by an English Bishop of the present day—'I would tell the penitent,' said his lordship, 'to sit down, and I would read to him the Comfortable Words'" (*Seven years at S. Saviour's, Leeds*).

People, not unnaturally, thought that there was much ado about nothing, if after the Priest had invited people, who could not go to the Holy Communion with a quiet conscience, to come to him or "some other discreet and learned minister, and open (their) grief, that by the ministry of GOD'S Holy Word (they) might receive the benefit of Absolution," all that the discreet and learned minister had to do was to read any verse or two of the sacred Scriptures. And if any doubt remained in their minds as to what the Church of England intended, it would be set at rest by the Nineteenth Canon of the Irish Church in communion with her, whereby it was ordered that a bell should be tolled before the administration of Holy Communion, for the purpose of enabling penitents to avail themselves of the *special Ministry of Reconciliation—i. e.*, "the benefit of Absolution by the Power of the Keys, which CHRIST has committed to the ministers for that purpose."

Nor was it only from the existing Book of Common Prayer that students deduced the intentions of the Church as to Confession and Absolution. If compulsory Confession was abolished in the first year of Edward VI., it was not purposed thereby to put an end to Confession and Absolution altogether. Auricular and secret Confession was still allowed to such as desired it, with the proviso, as now, that any discreet and learned Priest (instead of confining them to their parish Priest as before) might hear them. Henceforward there was to be a twofold difference between the Anglican and Roman Churches. Men were not "to be bound to the numbering of their sins," as the Homily terms it, nor to confess them to a particular Priest, whereas, within the Roman obedience, Confession was held to be obligatory, and that ordinarily to the parish Priest alone. And similarly it was found declared in the Book of Homilies, that Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sins: in Cranmer's Catechism, that GOD hath given the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the authority to forgive sins to the ministers of the Church; so that when men's sins do make them afraid and sad, they should seek and desire Absolution and forgiveness of their sins of the Ministers, which have received a commission and commandment from CHRIST Himself to forgive men their sins, and then their consciences shall have peace, tranquillity, and

quietness: in Latimer's *Sermons*, "to speak of right and true Confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing:" in Jewel's *Treatise of the Sacraments*, "that we allow Penance, though it hath not any outward element joined to it:" in his *Defence of his Apology*, "Abuses and errors set apart, we condemn it (Private Confession) not:" and in Becon's *Potation for Lent*, that there were many causes right urgent and necessary why auricular Confession should be approved, retained, maintained, and urged, and that the abuse only thereof should be taken away, and not the thing itself. Very significant, moreover, did it seem, that while on Queen Mary's accession many petitions were presented to Convocation for the restoration of faith and practice, in many points as they stood in the reign of King Henry VIII., no requisition was made on the subject of Confession, except to render it compulsory once a year[1]. What more reasonable conclusion could be drawn from this fact than that little or no alteration had been effected in regard to Confession and Absolution, in the reign of Edward VI., so as to demand revision. And as no trace of any material change in this matter of Confession could be discovered in the reign of Edward VI., so also during that of Elizabeth. Archbishop Parker, when making inquiry as to heresy throughout his province, specified as erroneous such a doctrine as that mortal voluntary sins are not remissible by Penance. And as the Visitation Articles of the seventeenth century were investigated it became clear that the same principle animated them. Overall, Andrewes, Cosin, Wren, Montague, Turner, all inquire whether the minister exhorts his parishioners to resort to him for the purpose of opening their griefs, and receiving the benefit of Absolution: whether the minister has ever revealed the secret and hidden sins committed to his trust: and whether he absolves the sick upon their Confession. Nor only so. The Canons and Constitutions of the seventeenth century were discovered strictly

[1] We may add to this silence on the part of requisitionists in Queen Mary's reign, the fact that Confession and Absolution are not among the subjects discussed in Laud's *Answer to Fisher the Jesuit*, nor among the charges of indictment preferred against Montague by Morton. Probably Laud did not mention the subject because Bishop White had done so, and established the point that "Protestants in their doctrine acknowledge that Private Confession of sins, made by penitent people to the pastors of their souls, and particular Absolution, or special application of the promise of the Gospel to such as are penitent, are profitable helps of virtue, godliness, and spiritual comfort" (*Conference with Fisher*, p. 186). Similarly Bishop Cosin numbers amongst points of agreement with the Church of Rome, one to be "in public or private Absolution of penitent sinners."

to forbid violating the seal of Confession, except in one instance, and thereby to assume the existence of such a system as required exceptions to be made.

If individual divines of the same period were consulted—Dean Boys[1], noted for his Anti-Popery, it was seen, preached that "albeit some scribbling scribe from an invective pamphlet against a discreet pastor executing this office, or some self-conceited Pharisee, tell the people, '*this man blasphemeth:*' he may, notwithstanding say to the sick sinner in his bed, '*thy sins are forgiven thee,*' and by CHRIST'S authority committed unto him, '*I absolve thee.*'" Dr. Crakenthorp defended the English Church by saying:—"We have abrogated neither Private Confession nor Private Absolution." Bishop Morton also, by admitting—"*It is not questioned among us* whether it be convenient for a man burdened with sin to lay open his conscience in private unto the Minister of GOD, and to seek at his hands the comfort of GOD'S pardon." Andrewes not only thanked GOD that his sins had been remitted "by the Power of the Keys," but also when he held the place of Prebend in Paul's belonging to him, as they call the Confessor or Confessioner in S. Paul's Cathedral, his manner was, especially in Lent, to walk daily at certain hours in one of the aisles of the Church, that if any came unto him for spiritual advice and comfort, he might impart it unto them. George Herbert makes one excellence of the *Priest to the Temple,* in the Visitation Office, consist in persuading the sick to particular Confession. Bishop Jeremy Taylor, not only in his *Holy Dying,* but also in his *Holy Living,* recognized abundantly the advantage of Confession and Absolution. Bishop Cosin urged "Sacramental Confession" and Absolution as for the better preparation for the blessed Sacraments. Chillingworth maintained the Catholic interpretation of the Visitation Office as the intention of the Church of England, and bade men not by their practice ever "suffer the commission given to His ministers to be a vain form of words without any sense in them, nor to be an antiquated expired commission of no use or validity in these days, but to have recourse to their spiritual physician, come to him as one that has authority delegated to him by GOD Himself to absolve and acquit them of their sins."

[1] He refers to Melancthon, Colman, Zepper, Bucer, Olevian, Luther, Musculus, Cruciger, White, and Field, to show that "Absolution, as well private or public, belongs principally, yea properly, *tanquam ex officio,* to the minister as Christ's ambassador in his Ecclesiastical function." And he wishes that Confession and Absolution might "one day be more fully restored in our Protestant Churches unto their Primitive sincerity."

Such testimonies as these became more striking when it was found that they were not mere remarks by the way, but the deliberate expression of judgments made in the face of all that could be advanced against Private Confession and Absolution. Hooker, for instance, could argue against extreme and rigorous necessity of Auricular and Private Confession enforced by the Roman Church, against the threefold definition of Penance, and against the doctrine of Satisfaction. Yet what could be put more strongly than Hooker's general view of the question? "Whether they remit or retain sins, whatsoever is done by way of order and lawful proceeding, the LORD Himself hath promised to ratify. This is that grand original warrant, by force whereof the guides and prelates in GOD'S Church, first His Apostles, and afterwards others following them successively, did both use and uphold that discipline, the end whereof is to heal men's consciences, to cure their sins, to reclaim offenders from iniquity, and to make them by repentance just." And again, "Because the knowledge how to handle our souls is no vulgar and common art, but we either carry towards ourselves for the most part an over soft and gentle hand, fearful of touching too near the quick, or else endeavouring not to be partial, we fall into timorous scrupulosities, and sometimes into those extreme discomforts of mind from which we hardly do ever lift up our heads again; men thought it the safest way to disclose their secret faults, and to crave imposition of Penance from those whom our LORD JESUS CHRIST hath left in His Church to be spiritual and ghostly physicians, the guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not only consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in the private particular case of diseased minds." And Hooker's quotation from Salvian against the notion of the Novatianists, that "every man ought to be his own penitentiary," seemed to go the same way, and to acknowledge that even the best and strongest of us might find it insufficient to exercise repentance, but might need to have it imposed upon us by the Church's authority. Thus may we understand what he meant when he elsewhere said—"For Private Confession and Absolution, it standeth thus with us, that the Priest's power to absolve is publicly taught and professed; and the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power."

In like manner, while Bishop Jeremy Taylor in his *Dissuasive from Popery* argued against any *proper* judicial power on the part of the Priest, he assumes that he ministerially judges. His main objections were urged against the Roman doctrine, that mortal

sins are irremissible unless confessed to a Priest. As to the general principle, he maintained that "the Church of England is no way engaged against it, but advises, practises it:" and that though "GOD alone can remit by His own right," "yet to this pardon the Church doth co-operate by her ministry." Archbishop Usher again, usually considered less Catholic in his tendencies, was found, while opposing the obligatory rule of Confession, and the claim of a proper, direct, and absolute Power of the Keys, to assert that "no kind of Confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us, that is necessary for the due execution of that ancient power of the keys." Bishop Hall, also inclined to the Puritan school, not only published *Four Decades of Practical Cases of Conscience*, in which are several things to astonish nineteenth-century Anglo-Protestants, but also in them discussed the question—"Whether I need, in case of some foul sin committed by me, to have recourse to GOD's Minister for absolution; and what effect I may expect therefrom." After urging the sinner whose soul is unquiet, to betake himself to GOD's faithful agents for peace, run to his ghostly Physician, lay his bosom open before him, flatter not his own condition, let neither fear nor shame on his part stay the Physician's hand from probing and searching the wound to the bottom, &c., Bishop Hall went on to show what he meant by Absolution: "It was not by way of a bare verbal declaration (which might proceed from any other lips), but in the way of an operative and effectual application, by virtue of that delegate or commissionary authority, which is by CHRIST entrusted with them. For certainly our SAVIOUR meant in these words to confer somewhat upon His Ministers, more than the rest of the world should be capable to receive or perform. The Absolution, therefore, of an authorized person must needs be of greater force and efficacy than of any private man, how learned or holy soever, and we may well say, that whatever is in this case done by GOD's Minister (the key not erring) is ratified in Heaven." "It cannot therefore but be a great comfort and cordial assurance to the penitent soul, to hear the messenger of GOD (after a careful inquisition into his spiritual estate and true sight of his repentance) in the Name of the LORD JESUS, pronouncing to him the full remission of all his sins." Dr. Hammond (on S. James v. 16), maintained that the Apostle, in bidding us confess our sins one to another, exhorted us to confess our sins to a Priest; and hence (*Sermon on Power of the Keys*) that Private Absolution "is *necessary* to every one whose conscience either is not able to perform and go through the work of inward repentance with GOD alone, or is

not able to satisfy itself with such performance without the Minister's assistance."

But the strangest and most unique instance of the difference between the seventeenth and nineteenth-century Protestants on this head was seen in a devotional work of Lewis Bayly, Bishop of Bangor, in the seventeenth century, entitled *Practice of Piety*—a book, the popularity and extended use of which is proved by the fact that it has passed upwards of seventy editions. Bishop Bayly bade the sick man send for some godly and religious Pastor, not only to pray for him at his death, but also upon his Confession and unfeigned repentance to absolve him of his sins. "For as CHRIST hath given him a calling to baptize thee unto repentance, for the remission of thy sins; so He hath likewise given him a calling and power and authority (upon repentance) to absolve thee from thy sins." Bishop Bayly not only went so far as to claim for Ministers of the Gospel the power of Absolution, but to deny it to Popish Priests, as scorning the name of Ministers of the Gospel. And he added that "the Antichristian abuse of this Divine ordinance should not abolish the lawful use thereof betwixt Christians and their Pastors in case of distress of conscience."

With the testimony of divines so little obnoxious to suspicion on account of their Catholic leanings, it was fairly enough concluded that, when Bramhall or Laud uttered similar opinions, they did but express the clear and unhesitating judgment of the Church of England. Bramhall's accurate deduction and distinction was in harmony with theirs when he said:—"He who saith, 'Whose sins thou dost remit, they are remitted; whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained;' which are the very words used in the Protestant's Form of Ordination, surely intends to confer a power to remit sins. We acknowledge that he who is ordained is enabled by his office to put away sins by special Absolution. To forgive sins is no more proper to GOD, than to work wonders above the course of nature. The one is communicable as well as the other. The Priest absolves: or to say more properly, GOD absolves by the Priest. Therefore he saith, 'I absolve thee, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST.' GOD remits sovereignly, imperially, primitively, absolutely; the Priest's power is derivative, delegate, dependent, ministerial, conditional." And Laud, while disavowing Roman Confession or Absolution, on being assailed for the promulgation of a Canon[1],

[1] "Albeit Sacramental Confession and Absolution have been in some places very much abused; yet if any of the people be grieved in mind for any delict or offence committed, and for the unburthening of his conscience confess the

whereby the Bishop or Presbyter was bound to absolve the person confessing to him, after the manner which is prescribed in the Visitation of the Sick, appealed to the learned of the Reformed Churches through Christendom. "All men (for aught I know) allowing Confession and Absolution as most useful for the good of Christians, and condemning only the binding of all men to confess all sins, upon absolute danger of salvation." And so Bramhall:—"Protestants have not pared away all manner of shrift, or Confession and Absolution."

Such were the last voices of the English Church, just before the eclipse of the Great Rebellion overshadowed her with its funereal pall. It seemed to the student as though the trumpet gave no uncertain sound on this topic up to that epoch. It could not but reassure those who listened to the dead thus speaking, that Confession and Absolution, rightly understood and used, were not, up to that date, held to be otherwise than Protestant or Anglican.

For this was found to be no mere paper theology, but a living practice. Hooker confessed to Saravia, and was absolved: Dr. Reynolds, who represented the Dissenting interest at Hampton Court, confessed, and being absolved before his death, kissed the hand of his absolver: King James I. on his deathbed besought Bishop Williams to give him Absolution[1]: Mrs. Dorothy Holmes' preparation for her end was by humble contrition and hearty Confession of her sins, which when she had done, says Bishop Cosin[2], she received the benefit of Absolution, according to the religious rites of our Church: Lord Derby, when going into battle with the Roundheads, made his Confession and received Absolution.

And as the last all-but expiring breath of the English Church testifies to the practice and theory of Private Confession and Absolution, so, phœnix-like, the same tone was heard at its revival. Does Dr. Pierce, President of S. M. Magdalene's, Oxford, and afterwards Dean of Sarum, preach before the King at Whitehall, upon Candlemas-day, 1661? It is to assail the Sectaries, for their imitation of Naaman's folly and disobedience,

same to the Bishop or Presbyter: they shall, as they are bound, minister to the person so confessing all spiritual consolations out of the Word of God; and shall not deny him the benefit of Absolution, after the manner which is prescribed in the Visitation of the Sick, if the party show himself truly penitent and humbly desire to be absolved." Canons sent up by the Scottish Bishops to Charles I. under his order, revised by Laud and Juxon.

[1] Laud's *Diary*, p. 158 note. Anglo-Catholic Library.

[2] Funeral Sermon (*Works*, i. p. 28).

in refusing to wash in Jordan. "I shall give but *one* instance," he says, and that is "in the Office of Confession, because it is amongst Christians a kind of Gospel Purification. The duty of Confession from the Penitent to the Priest, hath been commanded by the Church in the purest times of Antiquity; and however misused by the Church of Rome, hath been reformed, and not abolished by this of England. Now some malcontents there were, who thought our Church not clean enough, unless they might sweep away the pavement; and amongst other things, their stomachs rose against Confession. Will not GOD (say they) be pleased with the acknowledgment of the heart, but must that of the mouth be required also? must we pour out our souls into the ear of the Priest? But I would say to such an English or Scottish Naaman—'Wash and be clean,' that is, *Confess and be forgiven.*"

Jeremy Taylor, Sparrow, and Cosin were all advanced to the Episcopate, and their published opinions on Private Confession and Absolution were no bar to their promotion. True, Sparrow and Cosin complain that Private Confession and Absolution had fallen into desuetude: yet for all that they maintained them to be doctrines of the Church of England, and took care as Commissioners at the last review, in opposition to the Nonconformists, both to preserve the indicative forms of Absolution and to provide against the Nonconformist objection that "Ministers are obliged to absolve the unfit" by enacting that the penitent should be duly instructed as to the nature of it, when pronounced upon him. So Dr. Donne had said:—"This is the Sacrament of Confession. If GOD had appointed His Angels or His Saints to absolve me, as He hath His Ministers, I would confess unto them." Dr. Barrow maintained that Priests "remit sins *dispensative* by consigning pardon in administration of Sacraments, especially . . . absolving of penitents, wherein grace is exhibited and ratified by imposition of hands." Dr. Mark Frank enumerated Absolution amongst the ways by which the Minister prepares people for CHRIST'S coming:—"Sometimes clearing them by Absolution, sometimes purifying them with the Holy Sacrament." Dr. Heylin:—"Confession to be made to the Priest is agreeable both to the doctrine and intent of the Church of England." "Here," (in the Visitation of the Sick) commented L'Estrange, "the Church approveth of Auricular Confession." Thorndike was very express, inasmuch as he maintained that, "if it be the Power of the Keys that makes the Church, it will be hard to show the face of a Church, where the blessing of the Church and the Communion of the Eucharist is granted, and yet no

Power of the Keys at all exercised. Nay, it will appear a lamentable case to consider how simple innocent Christians are led on till death in an opinion that they want nothing requisite for the pardon and Absolution of their sins, when it is manifest that they want the Keys of the Church; as it is manifest the Keys are not used for that purpose" (*Just Weights*, p. 118).

Again, Isham was found in 1694 repeating the strongest passages of Bishop Taylor, and acknowledging not only that our Church presses particular Confession to the Priest, in case of grievous sins, but also that she does not discountenance the more frequent use of it: and Dean Comber distinguished between the three forms of Absolution as being respectively declaratory, petitionary, and judiciary. When Collier and others absolved Friend and Parkins on the scaffold, the English Bishops under Tenison signed a declaration to the effect, not that Confession and Absolution were contrary to the teaching of the Church, but that to absolve persons without moving them first to make special Confession of their sins was a manifest transgression of the Church's order, and abuse of the power left by CHRIST to His Ministers, and a sealing of the persons so absolved to their damnation. Archdeacon Goodman, writing against Popish Auricular Confession, spoke of the Priest's duty to "rummage" the conscience of the penitent, "nay to move him to make a special confession of his sins, and afterwards to absolve him on just grounds:" and the author of the *Whole Duty of Man* observed, on the Exhortation to come to the Priest before reception of the Sacrament, that such advice ought not to be neglected, neither then nor at any other time, when we are under fear or reason of doubt concerning the state of our souls: and that for the want of it many have run into very great mischief. So Bishop Patrick urged, in his *Book for Beginners*, that men who found that they were not safe should not be ashamed plainly to confess their sins, and lay themselves low in the presence of GOD and His Minister. Archbishop Wake asserted, as the doctrine and practice of the English Church, that it refused no sort of Confession, either public or private: that we exhort men sometimes, though they have no doubt or scruple to confess their sins, but especially before they receive the Holy Sacrament, to confess their sins; and when they have done it, the Absolution is so full that the Church of Rome itself could not desire to add any thing to it. Bishop Wilson said that our LORD had committed the Ministry of Reconciliation to us, that having brought men to repentance, we may in CHRIST'S Name, and in the Person of CHRIST, pronounce their pardon; and attributes the

prevalence of suicides to the want of comfort and Absolution by proper Pastors. Dean Sherlock dissuades persons from leaving the English Church for the Roman, on the ground that penitents in our communion may confess their sins to a Priest if they please, and receive Absolution. Bishop Beveridge speaks of Absolution as being as much the work of the Holy Ghost by means of God's Ministers as baptizing or communicating. Bishop Berkeley replied to a Romanizing friend, that Confession might be "had in our communion by any who please to have it," and admits "it may be very usefully practised." Even Bishop Horne pronounced that a soul when sick or wounded by sin must be recovered by Penance and Absolution. And as the admission of a living Bishop, who probably has no very keen sympathy with the Catholic movement, Bishop Short's declaration in his *History of the Church of England* was not without value, when he conceded that in the Church of England the Confession of particular sins is recommended, but that this Scriptural duty is frequently unknown and generally neglected (*History of the Church of England*, p. 171).

And the practice was still conformable. Bishop Sanderson received Absolution of his chaplain: Kettlewell was absolved by Bishop Lloyd: Evelyn's daughter begged a divine to be her ghostly father, and pray God to give her courage to acquaint him with all her faults: Mrs. Godolphin, according to Evelyn, had her ghostly father, to whom she often revealed her conscience, as from a child she before had done to a devout and learned prelate of our Church, by the extraordinary care of her pious and excellent mother: Lady Rachel Russell [1] advised her daughters to go to Confession, as she did, to Dr. Fitzwilliam, and explained to them how she herself prepared every month for it. Bishop Wilson thanked God for having given his deceased wife the benefit of the ministry of Absolution: Lady Capel being absolved, showed a heavenly comfort and peace after it: Lady Anderson was absolved on her death bed, to her no little comfort: Lord Digby, in his last extremities desired of all things to receive Priestly Absolution according to the Church of England's order and appointment. Even up to the time of George IV. the form of godliness in this respect was retained, the King's Confessor having always been numbered amongst the other officials of the Royal Household.

Of course no inquirer failed to observe that in the last century, if the decadence did not more closely follow the nonjuring

[1] See *Life of Lady Rachel Russell*, edited by Lord John Russell.

secession, that Fell, Nicholls, Wheatly, Warner, Shepperd, and Secker watered down the signification of Absolution to be little more than a liberation from Ecclesiastical censures, "no more intended to make a change in their eternal state than a pardon from the king is." With such explanations it was no wonder that Secker[1] was able to say for his day and generation that the form of Absolution was seldom requested, even by dying persons, and was seldom pronounced over any one. With such interpretations the "*benefit* of Absolution," for which the penitent was encouraged to hope in confessing his sins, became a mockery and mere verbiage. Nothing but a most debased form of Protestantism could have allowed of such constructions. And it was sufficient to consider that such evasions of the literal and natural meaning of Holy Scripture and of the Church's formularies never made their appearance prior to the cloudy and dark days which overtook the Church of England, until the revival of religion within her in the present century. Had any such idea pervaded the reviewers of the present Book of Common Prayer, when the Nonconformists objected to the indicative form of Absolution, it would have been easier and more likely to content their opponents, if the Bishops could have honestly avowed that the only object of Absolution was to release from Church censures, and to have no relation to their spiritual life and everlasting interests. With such a gloss it could not matter to the Nonconformists whether Absolution was in the indicatory or declaratory form. And as a proof that something more was felt to be intended by Absolution than this, there was found among the proposed alterations by the Dutch Stadtholder's Commissioners a substitution of a declaratory form in the Visitation Office, as well as an omission of the terms "benefit of Absolution" from the Communion Service. All along, with the exception then of the eighteenth-century reviewers of the Prayer Book, it had been assumed that Absolution had the promise of forgiveness of sins in some way or other. The Lutherans attributed all to the power of the Word, as they did in the Holy Eucharist, to produce a change of state; the Calvinists to the declaration of the promised forgiveness revealed in the Gospel. What the standard English divines held, has been seen to depend upon the authority committed to a duly appointed ministry for the remission of sins.

Another consideration appeared to have much weight. One

[1] Yet even Secker asserted, "Whenever people think it necessary, we are ready both to hear them with the utmost secrecy, and to pronounce them forgiven if we think they are."

of the notes of a true Church was defined at the Reformation to be "the right use of Ecclesiastical Discipline[1]." The Homily went on to say that "CHRIST ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent." Cranmer's finally settled views on this head were, as even Bishop Burnet conceded, expressed in his Catechism:—"Now GOD doth not speak to us with a voice sounding out of Heaven, but He hath given the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the authority to forgive sins by the Ministers of the Church." Even Jewel found fault with the Pre-Reformation use only, because preaching the Gospel was not considered as one mode of exercising the Power of the Keys, and that the Priests had made *all the virtue and use of the Keys* lie in hearing the Private Confessions of the people. Hence in Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions it was stated, that the Church of England retained "the Power of the Keys:" and every English Bishop and Priest was bound by his Ordination vows to minister "Discipline" as well as the Word and Sacraments. And in 1559, all Parsons, Vicars, and Curates were called upon to acknowledge the Church to be the Spouse of CHRIST, wherein "the authority of the Keys was duly used." Hence it appeared that as Private Absolution was the only way by which in these days discipline could be maintained at all, it was needful, in order to preserve one of the notes of a true Church, to revive Private Confession and Absolution. It did not seem sufficient for this end to content ourselves with devoutly wishing, once a year (as in the Commination Service), that the "godly discipline" used in the Primitive Church "may be restored again."

Moreover, it was hardly tolerable that so great a discrepancy should continue to exist between precept and practice, as was exhibited in the words of the Commission given to the English Priests, and in the way in which they latterly failed to fulfil it. The fact that our Reformers deliberately retained in the delivery of the Commission and in the mode of its exercise, terms of so strong and positive a kind as are only found in the latter Ordinals of the Western Church, and do not exist at all in those of the Eastern, was enough to force men to the conclusion that it was not a *vox et prœterea nihil*, when at their Ordination they received authority to remit and retain sins, and were bidden to absolve those who confessed unto them by virtue of that authority.

A presumption having been thus arrived at in favour of

[1] Homily for Whitsun-day.

Private Confession and Absolution, so far as the standards of the English Reformation and divines of the English Church were concerned, it was natural for those engaged in the revival movement to inquire how far such a presumption was borne out by Holy Scripture, and the consent of the Catholic Fathers. And here it was felt that as Absolution implied the necessity of Confession, all that was necessary was to learn whether Absolution was set forth in Holy Scripture. The very lowest idea of Absolution implied Confession, since it would have been absurd for a Minister even to reassure a penitent that he was pardoned by GOD, unless the Minister had satisfied himself on the subject of the penitent's state and feelings.

Now, that the power of absolving sinners was granted to the Apostles by our Blessed LORD, seemed irrefragable. When He said (S. John xx.) that He sent them as His FATHER had sent Him—that as He was the Apostle of the FATHER, even so they were to be His Apostles: and that in particular they were thereby and thenceforth invested with authority to remit and to retain sins, it seemed hopeless to conceive what the meaning of words could be, if they did not involve all that was claimed for them in regard to Absolution. And it appeared similarly in regard to the promise of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to S. Peter, either on the Roman theory, that they were a special prerogative of that Apostle and of His successor in the Apostolical See; or on the Anglican, that they were promised to him as the representative of the Apostolical College, that a Divine authority was delegated to the Apostles, so that the multitude should see it, and marvel, and glorify GOD, Who had given such power unto men (S. Matt. ix.). Moreover it was evident that this Commission to the Apostles was only a carrying out of our LORD's declaration in regard to the Jewish Church, that He had not come to destroy but to fulfil the Law. By that Law the Priest was appointed a judge of carnal lepers, and so shadowed forth the Evangelical Ministry to spiritual lepers. As the carnal leper must have shown himself to the Levitical Priest ere he could be pronounced clean, and be permitted to stand amongst the congregation of Israel, so was the spiritual leprosy to be dealt with by the Evangelical Priesthood. In both cases they only who showed themselves to the Priests, and satisfied their judgment, were undoubtedly cleansed. If it were maintained that the Christian Priest has not authority to judge between the clean and the unclean, he is much inferior to the Jewish Minister: if he has not power to cleanse as well to pronounce clean, as S. Chrysostom says (*De Sacerdotio*), he is not superior to him. In like manner it was

provided under the Law that all persons disqualified by special transgressions from approaching the Altar had to come to the Priest in order to be absolved. Nothing was clearer than that neither the solemn Paschal offering, nor the annual Day of Atonement, nor the regular morning and evening Oblations, sufficed for the cleansing of individual souls from these special transgressions. Every single soul whose conscience was burdened, had to come and confess its sin, before it was restored to the full privileges of the covenant.

Thus it was seen that Confession of sin belonged to an universal law of healing, which took its date from the Fall. When GOD interrogated Adam, it was to lead him to Confession, preparatory to the awful penance of sorrow and labour, to be consummated only by death. When He examined the conscience of Cain, it was for a like end. Joshua in like manner bade Achan not only give glory to GOD by Confession to Him, but also by telling Joshua what he had done. Nathan was sent to bring David to obtain the acknowledgment—"I have sinned." Thus, as S. Basil urged, "such among the Saints as in ancient times repented, confessed their sins." They who were baptized by S. John the Baptist confessed their sins. They who believed at Ephesus confessed and showed their deeds. It was on this account that CHRIST proclaimed His mission to be for the calling not of righteous but of sinners to repentance, and to invite the weary and heavy laden to come to Him for rest. And it was seen that though Lazarus was raised by CHRIST, as the type of deliverance from mortal sin, yet his salvation was incomplete until the disciples were bidden to "loose him and let him go." It seemed only to be in conformity with such Scriptural indications as these that S. James urged as a condition of healing Confession of sins, and intercession of a "righteous man." Taking all these Scriptures in connexion with each other, it seemed more difficult to escape from the obligation of Confession than to dispense with it.

And this because nothing was more plain in the history of the Christian Church than that the Priests thereof had from the first exercised the authority of remitting or retaining sins, for which end Confession was a necessary preliminary. Anciently, indeed, Private Auricular Confession was but a step towards Public Confession and Public Absolution. This Public Exomologesis was that "godly discipline" which the English Church wishes in the Commination Service "may be restored again," the "open penance," whereby notorious sinners were "punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the Day of the LORD."

Nothing testified more distinctly to the way in which priestly authority was wielded and recognized in the early Christian Church than the severity of the ancient penitential discipline. Viewed alongside with it the modern system of Private Confession and Absolution seemed rather liable to the charge of lowering the standard of penitence, of over-indulgence to human frailty, and of healing the hurt of GOD'S people too slightly. Private Confession and Absolution was after all a very mild form of penitential discipline, consequent upon the authority delegated by CHRIST to His Ministers. It was not an exaggeration of the exercise of spiritual power, but a derogation of it. All that the Church could do in the present day, if the bulk of her children resisted the Private Auricular Confession, would be to return to the Public Penance. She could only exchange the milder for the severer form of discipline. It could only be a change of the mode in which she exercised the powers of binding and loosing entrusted to her; it could not be an abandonment of her power and authority altogether. The last attempt at restoration of the ancient discipline by Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man, was a proof in the last century of the impossibility of attempting any return to its severity. The much-abused story of Nectarius [1], in the third century, went to the same point, and not against Private Confession in the abstract. When that Patriarch abolished the

[1] "The Penitentiary's office was appointed for the direction and comfort of such as should resort to him, in order to unburden their consciences of their secret sins; for assigning to each their measure of public penance, or else for assuring them that they did not need it; in short for counselling the publication of the sins so confessed to him in the face of the Church (as was usual in the case of notorious crimes), or else for directing the concealment of them within the bosoms of the parties who had been guilty of them.

"Indeed the occasion of abolishing the office proves to us what use was made of it. For when, by the imprudent direction of one of these Penitentiaries, a sin was publicly confessed which had been better concealed, the inconvenience which ensued upon the discovery was the cause why Nectarius, who then was Bishop of Constantinople, abolished the whole office. The consequence of which must have been, that such as had none at that time but secret sins, none which gave public scandal to account for, were left entirely to themselves, and to the guidance of their own judgments, whether they should resort to or abstain from the Holy Communion; they were thenceforward to be at their own peril, and if they approached unworthily, they were to answer for it to God and to their own consciences.

"Yet they were still, I presume, at liberty to use the advice of a ghostly counsellor, if they found themselves in want of it, only there was thenceforward no peculiar officer, whose distinct business it should be to receive such applications" (Marshall, *Penitential Discipline*, pp. 42, 43. Ed. Oxford).

office of Penitentiary, on account of the scandal which a particular case of Private Confession, as a preliminary to the Public Exomologesis, had caused, it was evident that it was the Public Penance, consequent on Private Confession in that age, which caused all the mischief. A Grand Penitentiary appointed to receive the Private Confessions of the Constantinopolitan Christians, with the view of referring them all to the Bishop for Public Penance, subject to the scandal resulting from it, was an exceptional provision, the abolition of which need not necessarily prejudice the appointment of a Grand Penitentiary for the purpose of hearing Private Confessions, when Public Penance ceased to follow as a necessary consequence. It was a very far-fetched conclusion for the English Homilist to draw from the case of Nectarius, that Private Confession, of every description, was abolished in that age, since it was only a particular kind of Private Confession which was discontinued, such as has had no parallel since. No one will pretend to assert that the Constantinopolitan Church and its dependencies have given up the practice of Private Confession. Holy Scripture, then, and the testimony of the Catholic Fathers of undivided Christendom, concurring in the recognition of the authority conferred by CHRIST on His Apostles and their successors to remit and retain sins, whether ministered by them privately or publicly, attention was naturally directed to the reasoning whereby sceptics attempted to evade the Scriptural and Patristic concordance.

It was found to be multiform. One set of objectors watered down the remission and retention of sins to be subjective acts on the part of the hearers of the Word. He who believed himself forgiven, had his sins remitted; he who believed not himself forgiven, had his sins retained. The Keys were faith and the HOLY SPIRIT. This of course was to substitute the dispositions of the heart for external authority. Although the co-operation of the HOLY SPIRIT was required in order to enable the Key to open the lock, whereby the penitent was shut out from GOD, yet it could not be the Keys which our LORD gave to the Apostles, since they had faith and the inspiration of the HOLY SPIRIT before they received them. Another set of objectors applied the remission and retention of sins to preaching and its effects. The preacher who sets forth the promises of the Gospel so that men embrace them, remits their sins; he who finds all his efforts of no avail, and shakes the dust off his feet against his recalcitrant hearers, retains their sins. For it was argued that to assume the power of doing more than this was beyond the power of mortal men, such as now are. Granting that the Apostles

did absolve or refuse to absolve sinners, they had the power also of working miracles. "Let the present claimants for the power of Apostolic Absolution show their faculty of raising the dead, and we will believe them to have the virtue of remission of sins." To this the reply was obvious, that the exercise of the Apostolic Commission was always dependent upon the dispositions of the penitent. All Sacramental acts of the Priest could have no effect upon the people except the required conditions on their part were fulfilled. Absolution could only be effectually given *clave non errante*. Why should more difficulty be found in the case of absolving a penitent, than in communicating an impenitent, or in baptizing an adult[1]? The baptism of an infant involved momentous consequences, yet no one had ever required that the baptizer should give a proof of his regenerating power by raising the dead. The offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, after giving due credit to the theological distinctions which separate the Roman and Anglican Churches, was fraught with tremendous results; yet who would withhold his belief in a Real Presence until the officiating Priest had cured a man blind from his birth? If indeed the Priest undertook to absolve the sinner whether he were penitent or not, he might be well expected to raise the dead as soon. But what really is the operation required, and what is demanded of the operator? "As GOD," says Hooker, "in the special case of David did authorize Nathan, so CHRIST more generally His Apostles and the Ministers of His Word in His Name to absolve sinners. Their power being equal, all the difference can be only in this, that whereas the one had prophetical evidence, the other have the certainty partly of faith and partly of human experience, whereupon to ground their sentence: faith to assure them of GOD'S most gracious pardon in Heaven unto all penitents, and touching the sincerity of each particular party's repentance, as much as outward sensible signs can warrant." There are special reasons why the Priest who is often called upon to hear Confessions should strive

[1] A writer on "Penance and Absolution," in *Fraser's Magazine* for February, stumbles here at the very threshold of Catholic truth. "That a fellow-man, by virtue of the authority vested in him at his ordination, should have the power to place me in a different relation to God, as my Judge, from that in which I should have been without his ministration, is a tremendous proposition, and the English Protestant rejects it altogether as a superstition." It is obvious that the writer is this English Protestant, who does not believe that Baptism or any other Sacrament places the recipient in a different relation to God from that in which he would have been without such ministrations. Such a person, on the same principle, must regard a sermon as incapable of converting a soul.

more fervently to become a man of God; but in the abstract he exercises no greater power in absolving a sinner, being penitent, than in regenerating a heathen, or in ministering at the Altar.

A question which also suggested itself to those engaged in the Catholic revival on this subject, was how far Confession was intended by the Church of England to be compulsory. Compulsory, in one sense, it could not be, since this is the difference between the English and other parts of Christendom, that it has no law or standard of faith and practice which prescribes Confession of mortal sin as an inevitable precursor of the Sacraments. Compulsory in another sense it could not be, since it is impossible to create in every one the requisite dispositions without which no Absolution is efficacious. But English divines had ruled with Bishops Cosin, Overall, and Montague, that if a man have committed any mortal sin, then we *require* Confession of it to a Priest; with Taylor and Herbert, that Confession is *necessary* in certain cases; with Comber and Sparrow, that every grievous sin *needs* Absolution. Bishop Cosin[1] describes the practice of the English Church as *requiring* that those to whom the Holy Communion is administered be "previously examined (explorati), absolved, or found worthy." Hence, in the next century, Dr. Fiddes, in his *Body of Divinity*, said that "Confession is under certain circumstances a duty:" that "the Priest is our proper spiritual guide, invested with the power, upon our repentance, of remitting sins:" that it seems "highly requisite, if not absolutely necessary, to all true penitents, where sacerdotal Absolution may be had, that it ought to be had:" and that he that dies without it "is in a very dangerous state, as he refuses God's pardon in His own way of applying it." A discussion took place in Charles the First's reign, at Cambridge, amongst the Heads of Houses, in reference to the sermon of one Adams on the subject. Adams affirmed that there was no salvation without Confession, and that Confession was as necessary to salvation as the Sacrament of Baptism. The Vice-Chancellor prepared a retractation; and the proposition that Adams should be required to sign it, was negatived by eight to five, Dr. Cosin being amongst the majority[2]. Dr. Cosin[3] said that the Church of England in the Thirty-nine Articles, where it condemned all the opinions

[1] *Regni Angliæ*, cap. xiii. Compare *Commentary on the Offices of Common Prayer* (Visitation of the Sick).

[2] Collier ii. p. 773.

[3] State Papers, quoted in the *Church Review*, Feb. 2, 1867.

and points of Popery that he thought Mr. Adams and others are bound also to condemn, did not yet condemn the opinion that some men had of the necessity of special Confession, and that the Book of Common Prayer seemed rather to give a man liberty to be of that opinion than to condemn him for it, where it says, "If a man cannot quiet himself by confessing to God, then let him go to a Priest, and open his grief."

Lest it should be thought that Adams' pronounced teaching respecting Confession and Absolution was singular, we have on record a like sensation created by Bishop Andrewes. Rowland White thus writes to Sir Robert Sydney, on a sermon preached by him March 30th, 1600:—"Dr. Andrewes made a strange sermon at Court on Sunday; his text was the twentieth chapter of the Gospel S. John, the twenty-third verse, touching the forgiveness of sins upon earth. That contrition without Confession and Absolution, and deeds worthy of repentance, was not sufficient. That the Ministers had the two Keys of power and of knowledge delivered unto them; that whose sins soever they remitted upon earth should be remitted in Heaven. The Court is full of it, for such doctrine was not usually taught there. I hear he was with Mr. Secretary about it, it may be to satisfy him" (Sydney's *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 185). As the sermon is extant, it is worth while to give one of its salient points:—"*Quorum remiseritis peccata.* We are not, the ordinance of God thus standing, to rend off one part of the sentence: Three are here express'd; and where Three are expressed, Three are requir'd; and where Three are requir'd, Two are not enough. It is S. Augustine that thus speaketh of this Ecclesiastical Act in his time; *Nemo sibi dicat,* 'Let nobody say within himself, I repent in private, I repent before God: God, Who pardons me, knows I repent from my heart: Then to no purpose was it said, "Whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loos'd in heav'n:" Then to no purpose were the Keys given to the Church of God; we make void the Gospel, we make void the words of Christ.'"

It was observable to any inquirer, that since the days of these divines the directions in the Visitation Office had been made stricter in regard to the necessity of Confession. Even if the early Reformers or Reformed Liturgies had manifested an anti-confessional tendency, our present Book of Common Prayer would absolve us from all obligation of paying any respect to them. It is now no longer left to the will of the sick person, but the Priest is directed to *move* him to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. What related to the Visitation Office in general applied

particularly to this later alteration. As it seemed akin to preaching up death-bed repentance, and encouraging people to rely upon it, to confine Private Confession and Absolution to the crisis in human life when men were least able to make a good Confession, and humbly and heartily desire Absolution, so it seemed to be a similar failure of duty on the part of the clergy if they never moved people to make special Confession during their lifetime. It appeared strange that the very earnestness exhibited by the Church that no one should pass out of this world with grievous sin upon his conscience, should be misinterpreted as though she did not desire, not to say did forbid, that her children should be moved to special Confession of sins at other times in their lives. Hence it was concluded that the Priest should take every opportunity of instructing his people in the deadly nature of post-baptismal sin: that he should move them to special Confession when their conscience was troubled with any weighty matter. He could no more bring his hearers involuntarily to Confession than he could compel the multitudes to come in and taste of the Eucharistic feast. But that he was to take no steps in the matter to move people at all times to special Confession, as though Absolution was only to be put before them with bated breath and hesitating speech, appeared utterly to contradict the spirit of the words with which he was sent forth as a Priest of the Church of God, and of the Visitation Office to which he had promised to conform. Upon the whole, what conclusion could be fairly deduced but that, if any of the English clergy were to be denounced as traitorous, unfaithful, and the like, such abusive adjectives were more applicable to those Priests who did not move their people to special Confession.

But since, as has been said, no positive law of the English Church existed by which such members as did not go to Confession could be debarred from the Sacraments, a question arose as to what position was occupied by them. What was the difference between two persons equally contrite, of whom one only confessed and was absolved? All along it had ever been held in the Catholic Church, that true contrition merited forgiveness through the Blood of the Atonement. In the early Church the system of Penance for secret sins was dispensed and sought for only as being the more effectual mode of remission and purification[1]. There are persons who are their own lawyers, their own

[1] Persons, however, who insist upon interrogations as to what difference we conceive may exist between the condition of an absolved and an unabsolved person, where both are equally contrite, might be fairly interrogated by us as

physicians, and their own counsellors. Such might well pause, considering the greater moment of the risk they run thereby, to become also their own confessors and absolvers. At any rate, therefore, such as go and show themselves to the Priest, benefit by the experience of those whose business it is to devote themselves to the cure of spiritual maladies, and receive grace at the hands of those who have been duly commissioned to absolve them. It did not seem worth while to enter into a discussion upon such a point of debate. It was enough that they who confessed and were absolved had availed themselves of the authorized channel of forgiveness, and had been certified by this sign of GOD'S manifest favour and good-will towards them. Some complicated this question by ignorantly introducing a Roman element. Both in the Roman and Anglican Churches any one who has committed mortal sin is required to confess. But in the Roman Church omission to confess under such circumstances is a breach of ecclesiastical law and a fresh mortal sin. Hence though contrition would ordinarily entitle the penitent to Absolution in Heaven, his wilful refusal to confess would, on the Roman theory, bar that Absolution. He would be bound on earth by the law of the Church, and therefore bound in Heaven. It is obvious that the English Church has, by leaving Confession optional, escaped this serious difficulty. Private Confession is medicinal, as was the Public in the days of the early Church. He who shrank from the latter for fear of the public shame had reason to fear that he also shrank from the necessary discipline of humiliation and consequent cure. So, he that shrinks from the former through misliking the private shame, has reason to fear that he also holds back from the requisite means of healing. In the latter case the penitent lost the intercessions of the Church: in the former he loses the effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man. Now, as then, Confession is voluntary. On the other hand it must be borne in mind that the absence of clearer instructions on this subject by the English Church has rendered Absolution more or less of a dead letter, and caused great loss of souls, who might else have been reconciled to GOD, consoled, and saved.

But allowing that people are free to resort to special Confession of sin in the English Church, it was asked with what limitations? In the early Church Penance was only once (at least for the same sin) permitted to the sinner. It was literally his second

to whether they would recognize any difference between the same persons if our Lord Himself had personally appeared to absolve one of them.

plank after tossing on the waves of this naughty world. Was Private Confession and Absolution to be but once allowed? There was no trace of any restrictions on this head in the formularies of the English Church. Men who usually boast of Anglican liberty in all other things, manifest a wonderful inclination to rigidity and severity on this point. They would lay all souls upon one Procrustean bed of justice, and deal out alike to all the same measure of grace. The English Church was free either to return to the ancient system at once, or to content herself, as she does, with bewailing the impossibility of doing so, and to adapt her mode of reconciliation and cure of sinners to the times in which we and our fathers have lived. She has wisely followed the latter course. George Herbert, Taylor, Chillingworth, and the author of *The Whole Duty of Man*, held that Confession was suitable for all times and all cases. The author of the *Golden Grove*, Cosin, and Patrick, lay down that the frequency of resorting to a spiritual physician is to be regulated by men's occasions and necessities. Hence such terms as Confessor, the holy man, the ordinary judge, spiritual guide, director, ghostly father, private guide and judge are applied to the Priest by Taylor, Walton, Wheatly, and others, all indicating that Confession was not to be an exceptional act in a man's lifetime; but that to resort to one's spiritual physician was no more to be narrowed within certain bounds than are applications to the healers of our bodily ailments. The Church invites her members to have recourse to her Ministers, not only for "quieting the conscience," but also for "avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness." Even in the Ancient Church, when Private Confession was a preliminary to Public, Private was more frequent than Public, since the Priest had to decide, from the nature of the private revelation, whether any and what Public Penance should be imposed. It was only what was to be expected, that with the cessation of public discipline, and the substitution of private discipline, Private Confessions would increase rather than otherwise, when the dread of a public exposure of secret sins was taken away. The only limits of Confession in the English Church are those which Hooker has laid down—"that the practice thereof proceed in due order, and that though there be given unto penitential jurisdiction the power of remitting sin, yet no such sovereignty of power as that no sin should be pardonable in man without it." (*Eccl. Polity*, VI. vi. 3.)

From the above considerations it is evident that the return to Private Confession and Absolution was a necessary conse-

quence of the general revival of earnest religion in the English Church, as well as of dogmatic teaching in regard to baptismal responsibilities. People became more anxious, diffident, and scrupulous in what concerned their souls and eternity. If sin after Baptism was felt to be more deadly, a special medicine was needed for its cure, and at whose hands could it be more naturally looked for than at theirs, who were appointed by GOD as His ambassadors to reconcile mankind to Himself?

For this end the Church had sent them forth as Priests of the Church of GOD, to move the sick to special Confession, and to invite the healthy to come to them for the benefit of Absolution, not only for the quieting of conscience, but also for the removal of all scruple and doubtfulness. In all this there was nothing contrary to Protestantism, except to that wretched caricature which attempts to pass current for it in the nineteenth century. In the sixteenth, seventeenth, and even eighteenth centuries, Protestants like Usher, Bayly, Hammond, Hall, Owen, Reynolds, and Cecil, could defend or receive Private Confessions, and give Absolution without incurring censure as Romanizers or Papists in disguise. Then men had so studied theology as to be able to distinguish between what was peculiar to the Roman view of penance, and what was not; between what was held by the Roman Church to be the only way of obtaining forgiveness, and what was held by the English Church to be the best way; between what was held by the Roman Church to be satisfactory for sin, and what was held by the Ancient Church to be medicinal. And above all, with Hooker, Taylor, Donne, Overall, Cosin, Montague, Andrewes, and like honoured names, to maintain the principle of Sacramental Confession, there could be no doubt what sense the Church of England attributed to the Power of the Keys, and to the remission and retention of sins.

With such inevitable conclusions before him, the English Priest has only the plain and obvious duty to meet the obligations which lie upon him, as having received authority to bind and to loose, to remit and to retain sins. All doubts which may be raised by others as to his individual fitness to discharge so momentous and delicate an office as that of Confessor, should only stir him up to seek more abundant supplies of that HOLY SPIRIT, Who alone can hallow our poor humanity, and infuse His grace through mean and unworthy channels without danger of being impaired. Well indeed is it for him to be reminded of the necessity of attaining to that purity unto which all things are pure, of deepening penitence, and of progress in the spiritual life. Indeed, there is something providential thus to have to deal

more closely with the souls of his people, since he is thereby urged on to sanctify himself more entirely, so as to obtain greater illumination and closer union with God. But for such incitements to press onward in the way of Eternal Life, there were danger that the people would, in a period remarkable for deep thought on religious topics, and for much devotion, outstrip the Clergy in piety and godliness. Let the Clergy, therefore, who have openly professed their hearty belief that they have been "truly called according to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ," and the Order of this Church of England, "to the order and ministry of Priesthood," labour to be "clothed with righteousness," and to obtain such Heavenly wisdom that "the word spoken by their mouths may never be spoken in vain." Every attempt to ridicule their infirmities, to lay bare the small amount of preparation or of knowledge with which they have often to enter upon their duties, or to magnify the little conformity of their social position or of their domestic relations, should all the more stir them up to humility, study, and self-denial. If they are prejudged as unfit to be Confessors because their training has been too secular and mundane [1], let them for their comfort remember that the Roman Clergy are charged with unfitness because of their previous seclusion and ignorance of the world, and of their having been shut out from all familiarity with the wondrous microcosm of the human heart [2]. Let nothing at least induce them to be parties to a living lie [3], which shall send forth Priests to remit sins, and forbid the exercise of the powers to which it sent them forth: which shall invite the living and the healthy of body to come for the benefit of Absolution, but devise all possible excuses to withhold it, and all possible theories to escape being called upon to impart it: which shall bind the Priest to move the sick and dying to confess all weighty matters burdening their souls, but induce him to leave them to themselves, and depart this life of grace bound and retained, not loosed nor let go. And in order to realize more effectually what it is that he is called upon to dispense to others, the Priest who is often required to hear the

[1] Letters by S. G. O. in the *Times*, during the autumn of 1866.

[2] *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1867.

[3] Bishop Andrewes, in the Sermon above alluded to, p. 222, after taking notice that "in the Ordination of Priests are these very words, *Quorum remiseritis peccata:* Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven," adds "to exclude them is (after a sort) to wring the Keys out of their hands, to whom Christ hath given them; is to cancel and make void this clause of *Remiseritis*, as if it were no part of the sentence; to account of all this solemn sending and inspiring *as if it were an idle and fruitless ceremony.*"

Confessions of others, should necessarily himself often confess. As the physician of the body, when himself labouring under infirmity, trusts not to his own skill, but seeks the aid and impartial judgment of his professional brethren, so it must be with the Priest. He, above all men, must fear the proximity of evil, the dangers which beset the spiritual life, and the rapidity with which the infection of sin may spread. He above all men must shrink from self-absolution and doubt self-imposed penances. Writers[1] who insinuate that "the great High Church Bishop X, or the greater Anglican Director Y," are never "absolved themselves," are as much in the dark and in the wrong as when they would represent Absolution to be confined to *women*.

Such imaginations show only the weakness of our critics. They would cover Absolution with contempt, as being the resource of weak women or of feminine men. What is this but the old cry against Religion in general? What is this but akin to the scoffing censure that our churches are filled and our Altars crowded with women? Yet it is a striking fact in the present day, that if any churches are more thronged with men communicants than others, those are most remarkable on this account where the doctrine and practice of Private Confession and Absolution are most clearly encouraged. We have yet to learn that the patient, who boldly submits to a painful and distressing operation for the sake of health, deserves to be branded as being more effeminate than those who cannot nerve themselves to submit to the probe and knife of the surgeon. Now to face shame and confusion demands more moral courage and more manliness than to endure pain.

What, however, we suppose is really intended by this charge of effeminacy, as the result of Private Confession and Absolution, is a scrupulosity and a tenderness of conscience. The muscular Christian avows that instead of entertaining any scruple as to the moral responsibility entailed by a successful law suit, "most of us would feel our consciences quite at ease, and confine our anxiety to the question whether we should get a verdict or not[2]." No doubt that expresses the habit of mind of the *ci-devant* Protestant. And the ruffian who escapes hanging by some technicality, arrives at a like conclusion. Casuistry is with such persons a dead science and in ill-repute, and they are rarely troubled with cases of conscience. They take the good the gods provide them without question or demur. This is with our critics the Eutopia of existence. But this state of mind is just that which

[1] *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1867. [2] *Ibid.*

seems so dangerous to those who question the wisdom of resting in all cases satisfied with human tribunals, and the unstable results of law pleas, and with the verdicts of public opinion and the praises of our fellow-creatures. Many have needed to review the sentence of the Bench, or of the world at large, when given in their favour, and been glad to bring their doubts and difficulties before a more inward and spiritual tribunal. Nothing more distinctly brings out the antagonism of the Church and the World, than this disposition of the spiritual man to question acquiescence with secular judgments, however much they may be on his side. It is a tender conscience which most distinguishes the Saints of God. It is accompanied with humility, abiding sorrow for sin, dread of incurring the least taint of iniquity, and with unwillingness to judge and censure others. It looks on with awe to the Day of Doom, and embraces in time every opportunity of anticipating the sentence that else would go forth for Eternity. To judge ourselves that we be not judged of the Lord, to apply to others, such as are now set over us in the Lord, for assistance in this necessity of weighing and balancing our words and works, is not cowardice or pusillanimity, but it is the boldness of men who, being on the eve of a great and calamitous bankruptcy, look their affairs and their creditors in the face, and set themselves to work to repair their house in spite of the disgrace and instant ruin of fortune which may be the consequence of openness and honesty in their revelations.

Those who imagine that there can be no resorting to Private Confession and Absolution without the risk of an ultimate desertion of the English Church, are as much out in their results as they are in their theory. It is true that we cannot by any statement on this point hope to propitiate persons of such narrow-minded views as would tolerate in their Communion none but those who agree in opinion with themselves. Yet there are some, we may hope, who may be inclined to lay aside their dread of Romanizing consequences by the consideration that any prohibition of Private Confession and Absolution, such as is now sought at the hands of Parliament (as in the days of the Great Rebellion) in regard to the lawful and authorized Vestments of the English Church, would only lead her children to seek for the Sacrament of Penance elsewhere after a less Primitive model. These calm and reflective minds may be soothed by the fact that Private Confession and Absolution have often been the only means whereby wavering souls have been steadied and confirmed in their loyalty to their spiritual Mother. And if assurance can

be given, as it is, that in these days of great religious commotion, when the fountains of the great deep are broken up, members of other Churches have found rest for the soles of their feet in our Catholic portion, chiefly and solely because it retained the Power of the Keys, as one clear note of ecclesiastical organism, men of larger hearts and fewer prejudices will admit that a revival of theory and practice, which at once retains and attracts, is not to be treated with contempt or denunciation.

Finally, it would be well to bear in mind that a widespread desire seems to be manifesting itself, not only in the English Church but even in various forms of Dissent, for other accompaniments of Divine Service than what contented our forefathers. Nothing could be more melancholy than the prospect of any advance of Catholic sentiment and Catholic externals without a corresponding increase of Catholic strictness and discipline; and it seems to have been providentially ordered, as a security against empty formalism or sickly sentimentality, that while the English Priesthood have yielded to the urgent cry of the laity for the multiplication of services, and of accessories to those services, they have taken the opportunity to urge upon the laity those corrective restraints and salutary preservatives so necessary to remind those who love to see "the Queen in her vesture of gold, wrought about with divers colours," that "the King's Daughter is all glorious *within*." To meet the danger of profanations, in augmenting Holy Communions, we ought not to curtail the number of celebrations; but we ought rather to increase the provisions for securing the worthiness of communicants. Nor should we sweep away the fascinations of Christian art, painting, sculpture, music, and architecture, because there is a peril of externals taking too great a hold upon Churchmen; but we should all the more press home to them the realities of which these externals are but the shadows. The true remedy for "excess in Ritualism" is to be found, not in abridgments of ceremonial, but in the revival of that portion of primitive discipline still left to the English Church in the right use of Private Confession and Absolution.

JOHN CHARLES CHAMBERS.

Religious Toleration.

Some men boast without reserve of the summary manner in which they would extinguish (if they could) the religious practices and opinions of those who differ from themselves; and others openly declare that, in his relations to God, man needs no control whatever, but may safely think and do as seems right in his own eyes. There appear therefore just grounds for discussing the question, whether there is a rational medium between anarchical laxity and tyrannical rigour? It is this rational medium that the majority of mankind, when they stop to think, desire to find, and which they call Toleration.

Toleration, although it fluctuates in its application with the multiform opinions of men, is not so indefinite in its verbal signification, but is generally employed to denote, either the conditional liberty given by the State to bodies and individuals in matters of religion, or that allowed by religious bodies to their members. It is on the nature and limits of this liberty, as it exists within our own Church, and not on that happy absence of external persecution which now generally prevails, that a few thoughts are ventured in the present Essay. Abstractedly considered, the subject may not be a difficult one; but the incapacity of the human mind, and the seeming impossibility of setting any political or religious question at rest for any length of time, have made it such. There are but few fundamental axioms on which men are really agreed. One would have thought, for instance, that the following position, "The Church has a right to dictate her own terms of membership," or this, "The Church has a right to decide when sufficient compliance with her terms has been shown," would be accepted as self-evident; but experience tells us that the reverse is true, and that almost any oracle on the sufficiency of compliance is consulted rather than the Church herself. Independence and liberty of action are right every where but here.

But if the scheme be somewhat difficult, it is unquestionably important. While it is unfavourable to both truth and peace that heresy and insubordination should be uncontrolled, and the questions raised by them be kept in a state of continual flux, it is equally unfavourable to truth and peace that the cords of uniformity should be drawn too tightly, and discontent thus

provoked to rebellion. It is of still greater importance that no offence should be committed against the Author of Revelation, through an unfaithful use of the deposit entrusted to man—a trust the administration of which is confessedly consigned to us for the increase of His glory, as well as the promotion of our own happiness, in this world and beyond the grave. Nevertheless, the Church has been so attacked from without, and so convulsed from within, ignorance and evil passions have been so dangerous to personal security, that this highest consideration of all has been thrown into the shade, and selfish ends substituted for the great end of all. But although such latitude has been allowed by Providence to the power of evil, there has ever been enough good mingled with the evil to prevent us from despairing of reformation, and the promises of prosperity for the Church, which are on record, are ample enough to preserve an unfaltering expectation of final victory.

The conclusion to which we ought to come, concerning the possibility of an effective Toleration, seems to be as follows:—That with a wider diffusion of charity, and a rectification of the machinery by which the Church legislates and administers her affairs, great advance might be made in finding out a medium between a persecuting rigour and a latitudinarian laxity. With the inculcation of charity it is not the purpose of this paper to speak. Although little enough practised, it is sufficiently advocated on all sides. And a consideration of practical measures and the indication of abuses is more likely to produce substantial fruits. But while mention is made of the latter subject rather than of the former, it must never be forgotten that schemes of comprehension and exclusion have failed in their design or execution for the most part precisely for this reason, that they originated in some love of triumph, or some lust for gain, or some desire for extended empire, or some other mundane spring of action, rather than that charity which loves GOD for His own sake, and all mankind for GOD'S sake.

The word Toleration obviously connotes non-toleration; excommunication of nonconformists is coeval with the existence of communities. A society which is formed for the promotion of certain ends, and for mutual assistance in the promotion of those ends, would soon cease to exist, if it took no measures to eliminate elements of disunion from its organism. The great society of the nation is based upon this principle; she punishes her nonconformists with imprisonment, outlawry, and even with death itself. The smaller private associations, which exist for the increase of wealth and comfort, are never without some means

of judging whether their members act harmoniously with the principles of the society, and excluding them if they do not. The evil of an ill-devised Toleration is therefore as great as the advantage of its converse. It undoes that co-operation which enables man, individually so powerless, to realize collectively mighty achievements; it prevents the repulsion of the common enemy; it ties the hands when grand common objects are to be attained; it impedes deliberation, disturbs repose, and renders all happiness insecure.

Toleration is the reverse of this. It is the retention of men within the bounds of association. It may be sympathy in its coldest and lowest form, but it is still sympathy. It makes men brethren, if not as the sons of the same parents are brethren, still as members of the same society are brethren. Of course, there must be times when judgment hangs in the balance, and we hardly know whether a man is one of us in spirit or not, and then there can be but little sympathy; but suspicion of this should be justified by formal proof, and no one who avails himself of an allowed latitude should be called a traitor. To confess in our cooler moments that latitude is suitable, and yet when heated by party spirit to require uncovenanted agreement in minutiæ, is to behave as an unreasonable being; but it is evident that a community must be continually subject to this temptation, when ready recourse may not be had to some tribunal which can decide on the existence of unwarrantable deviations. Doubts must cause disorder till they are decided, just as ulcers fester and discharge until they are healed.

Those who are accustomed to see nothing in the New Testament but texts suitable for the guidance of the individual conscience, would be surprised to find, if they read it for this purpose, how much is said therein about Toleration, non-toleration, and the organization of the Church in general. More than the mere germ of the belief, that the Church is a religious state with its officers and laws, its Councils, and its rights, is discerned in the Scriptures, by the eyes of those who interpret its words by the practice of primitive times, and believe that it is a Kingdom under the permanent Headship of Christ. This is the more remarkable when we reflect that the New Testament was not intended to be a manual of ecclesiastical polity, being in fact a miscellaneous collection of historical records, and casual letters of Apostles to their converts. We have no reason to conclude that these documents are more than a part of the writings of which the Prophets of Apostolic or Is-Apostolic rank were the authors. Nevertheless, we find in them frequent reference to

certain limits, beyond which non-compliance with constitutional principles becomes heresy and schism. The existence of a generous but limited Toleration may be recognized in such expressions as these:—"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things;" "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak;" "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations;" "Let us not judge one another any more;" "To the weak I became as weak, that I might gain the weak;" "Strive not about words to no profit;" "Be ye gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves;" "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy;" "Ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." Such exhortations as these would seem not only intended to forbid private animosities, but to put Christians on their guard against abuse of discipline, and to prevent misinterpretations of the coactive Power of the Keys, concerning which the New Testament speaks with no stammering tongue.

The foregoing citations show the spirit in which those that follow are to be interpreted. Order is to be maintained by censure and expulsion, but the motive is to be pure and the manner gentle:—"Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves;" "God hath set in the Church . . . . governments;" "I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind in earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven;" "If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican;" "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained;" "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many;" "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear;" "Whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme;" "Others save with fear;" "We command you in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye received of us;" "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed;" "In the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for

the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the LORD JESUS;" "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person;" "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject;" "Warn them that are unruly;" "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses."

The force of these words, which are in themselves decisive against licence and confusion, is considerably heightened, if we take them in connexion with others in which the symmetry, solidity, and unity of the Church is declared:—"As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so we, being many, are one body in CHRIST, and members in particular; for by One SPIRIT we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free;" "Both Jews and Gentiles are fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the household of GOD; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, JESUS CHRIST Himself being the chief corner stone; in Whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the LORD;" "There is one fold and one Shepherd;" "There is one body and One SPIRIT, One LORD, one faith, one baptism, one GOD and FATHER of all;" "Continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship;" "The Head even CHRIST, from Whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted, maketh increase unto the edifying of itself in love." These texts are quoted together and at length, that the striking cogency of them may be fully seen. Any unbiassed reader must gather from them, that the idea of a multitudinous, Antinomian Church, with ill-defined doctrines, feeble polity, lax coherence, discordant customs, is as totally alien to the outline of the New Testament as to the illustration of it in the days immediately following the Apostolic era.

The above-quoted texts are not unskilfully condensed in the Thirtieth Article of the Westminster Confession of Faith:—"The LORD JESUS as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate. To these officers the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that Kingdom against the impenitent both by the word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the Gospel and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require. Church censures are necessary for the reclaiming and gaining of offending brethren, for deterring others from the like offences, for vindicating

the honour of CHRIST, &c. For the better attaining of these ends, the officers of the Church are to proceed by admonition, suspension from the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper for a season, and by excommunication from the Church, according to the nature of the crime and the demerit of the person." The chapter on Synods is also able:—"It belongs to Synods and Councils ministerially to determine controversies of Faith and cases of conscience, to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of GOD and government of His Church, to receive complaints in cases of mal-administration, and authoritatively to determine the same, &c." The Catholic theory is here corroborated by an independent witness.

Any work on Ecclesiastical Antiquities will show how perfectly the first Christians acted on these principles. To their ordinary measures for keeping the Church holy and united they added those of censure, and partial or total excommunication. "A good Bishop," says S. Ambrose, "desires first to heal the infirm; at last he cuts off with grief what cannot be healed." Bingham quotes in illustration the excommunication of Andronicus, by his Bishop, Synesius, and shows that we may collect these particulars from it—that such a sentence was compared to the expulsion of Adam from Paradise, that the judgment of one Church was ratified by the rest, that a disregard of the censure on the part of others subjected them to the same punishment, and that the condemned were avoided as depraved in social life. Bingham also proves by quotations the reasons that were assigned for the use of this discipline—that the victim might be ashamed, that others might fear, that the scandal and contamination might cease. The offerings of those cut off were refused, intermarriage with Christians was forbidden, their books might not be read. S. Chrysostom indeed believed that this practice was used with unnecessary severity, and argues against anathematizing persons, preferring to confine it to opinions and actions. But his Homily upon this subject (*Homily* 76) only shows what the prevailing practice was in his day, and how strong a tendency then prevailed not to neglect discipline necessary for the purity of the Church, but rather to carry it to extravagant lengths.

It is not to be denied that, whatever may have been the moderation of exceptional teachers, there has been a tendency from the earliest times to intolerance. In the sixteenth century, Servetus was burned through the intolerance of Calvin; and many thousands have fared likewise in the various wars of opinion. Historians commonly mention the death of Priscillian by order of Maximus, brought about by the agency of Thacius, Bishop

of Sossuba, in the fourth century, as the beginning of such punishments of the crime of heresy. "In the fifth century," says Mosheim, "banishment and confiscation were the ordinary punishments of the Donatists, and even the pain of death was inflicted upon such as surpassed the rest in perverseness." The Arians and the Orthodox both availed themselves of brute force, when they could command it, to repress their adversaries. Both sides freely applied for support to the Emperors, and in spite of a more spiritual theory, Religion directed the civil sword. It was the same in the case of the Manichæans. The predominance of force and civil condemnations in the place of persuasion and spiritual censures, as time went on, is of course too notorious to require illustration. The pages of ecclesiastical history are stained with blood. The evil is not yet extinct, though probably the great majority of Europeans would admit that infliction of personal punishment for religious opinions is to be deprecated. Under punishment, however, it seems unfair to classify certain burdens, such as church-rates, from which Nonconformists are not exempt. Such imposts depend on a principle altogether different; they are certainly not fines inflicted on account of religious opinions. But as the subject of this Essay confines itself to Toleration within the Church, the history of penal statutes and their repeal is not now to the purpose. It is with a much milder form of coercion that we of the present day are concerned.

Those who refuse to be bound by any laws at all, are very quick in calling coercive measures *persecution;* but this is an abuse of language. Religious persecution is a cruel and unjust annoyance of those who hold a certain belief, and not all penal correction of those who offend against the institutions of the body to which they profess to belong. We are not speaking now of political toleration of sects, or of the conduct of one Church towards another, which is beyond the scope of this paper. A care that all members of a society should combine to maintain the doctrine, customs, and discipline of their own community, is so far from being persecution that it is the exercise of a most necessary charity. Persecution implies vice. The refusal of Toleration is very often virtuous. There may be, and there has been, persecution within a Church, but it is nevertheless against the principles of a Christian Body, unless it be a very corrupt one, that there should be such a perversion of justice. Those who are not content that a person or party in the Church should avail themselves of the latitude which the law allows, but out of revenge or hatred, or some other unworthy motive, attempt to

abridge the liberty of such, or those who, when a question has been judicially settled, should revive it again and again to the annoyance of those to whom they are opposed, these would justly be said to persecute. But as it is the *malus animus* which justifies the imputation of intolerance, and as this is usually disguised by the profession of a righteous motive, men must be slow to accuse others of persecution. In meeting such treatment it is a duty to abstain from retaliation, or at least from giving prominence to suspicions which cannot be altogether excluded from the mind. This is policy as well as virtue. A favourable verdict is most likely to follow both from courts of judicature and from public opinion, when the accused has maintained a dignified composure and calmly taken his stand upon truth and justice. If they bear this in mind, those who at the present time are honestly endeavouring to abolish the abuses of the past, and to invest the Catholic Religion once more with the dignity, beauty, orthodoxy, and influence which it ought to have, but get no thanks for it, will ultimately win respect even from those clamorous adversaries who threaten to attempt to drive them out of the Church.

The vicious extreme opposed to persecution is anarchical licence, a state fatal to a Church's welfare, inasmuch as it leaves Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline wholly unprotected. This state frequently favours persecution. Absence of restraint tempts men to disorders, and these disorders again lay men open to the operations of dormant laws, revived unexpectedly out of spite. It is from this protracted lawlessness with its train of attendant evils, indifference, dishonesty, hypocrisy, ignorance, and contention, that our Church is now grievously suffering. The multitude evidently think that it does not much matter, so long as external decency is preserved, what is practised, or even what is believed. Men receive emoluments for trust which they do not faithfully discharge; they use rites and ordinances which they do not value, with an appearance of piety which they do not feel; they repeat formulas which they have never heartily studied, and do not clearly understand; they find, if they are controversially inclined, an enemy in every one whom they meet, for no two persons think absolutely alike. Such a period of bewilderment has been the lot of our Church of late, and during it, the rectification of the law according to the wants of the time has been suspended. The voice of the Synod has, until very lately, ceased. Priests, except when actually performing Divine Service, have become undistinguishable from laymen. Bishops have degenerated into—as some have been developed from—school-

masters and men of business. The laity have lost knowledge of the distinction between Churchman and Dissenter, save that some think that all social respectability is with the first, and others, that all piety is with the second. The labour of undoing these abuses and reclaiming this confusion will prove an Herculean task, which unfortunately will fall on the shoulders of a generation whose predecessors have left them without equipment for the enterprise.

It can hardly be questioned that our Church, if she would avoid rapid disintegration, should set herself in order, and that the different parties which she comprises should be willing to forego all that they conscientiously may, for the sake of preserving and concentrating her authority. This leads us to consider an accidental cause of prejudice against such authority, which has insensibly misled the judgment of many. Ever since the Reformation, the minds of men have been more or less agitated on the question of State Toleration, or Toleration on the part of the State of all Religious Bodies, and arguments in favour of this position have been allowed to influence the mind against coercion within the Church. The cases are widely different. All will admit in these days that the Civil Power should not prevent men from worshipping God according to the dictates of their conscience. This has been maintained in the Church itself, more or less, in spite of the temptation, not always resisted, to borrow the sword of the State for the purpose of persecution. Where the public peace, or ordinary morality, or the liberty of others is not endangered, all Churches and sects should enjoy the rights of citizenship, irrespectively of their religion. Successful tyranny has for long periods hidden this principle from men's eyes; but there has generally been some faithful voice raised in favour of what may be called a natural and Scriptural right. The State never made a Religion either true or false, and has no right to prohibit it. It may select one and throw its ægis over it, while it leaves the rest to themselves; but it may not outlaw the rest, unless they rebel against the laws, or teach impiety and immorality, or persecute the disciples of other creeds. Bishop Jeremy Taylor quotes a saying of Tertullian:—"It is a principle of human justice and natural liberty, that a man should be allowed to worship what and whom he chooses." Lactantius is quoted as saying the same thing:—"Religio cogi non potest." Cases will sometimes occur in which the sovereign power may interfere indirectly, that is, when detriment to the State is apprehended. At such times the necessary authority over all subjects will be sustained. All must admit that this is inevitable. The manner

of interference may be wise or unwise, but without the right of repression governments could not exist. Woe be unto the State if it fight against GOD.

A legitimate exercise of civil power in matters ecclesiastical exists, where the Church, holding only a spiritual sword, is unable to defend herself, if force be required, against injustice. Suppose one of her officers deposed, but continuing to retain property belonging to the Church. In this case she sometimes craved assistance from the secular power, even whilst it was heathen. When the Council of Antioch deposed Paulus Samosatensis, but could not remove him from a house belonging to the Church, of which he still kept possession, they had recourse to Aurelian, the heathen Emperor; he ordered the house to be delivered to those to whom the Bishops of Italy and Rome should write with approbation. This is the course which the State now adopts in the case of independent religious bodies. If a Roman Catholic or a Methodist were to insist in retaining property, in spite of an adverse decision of the body to which he belonged, the Civil Court would consider the laws of that body as well as the law of the land, and judge the accused accordingly. The Court would not enter upon the merit of such laws, but only satisfy itself as to the recognized validity of them. It would not be open to it to say — "You must settle this question among yourselves; it is a religious question;" for it is the business of the law to see that none be despoiled of that which of right belongs to them. In carrying out this principle, it is necessary to see that contracts between members of a religious body, whether established or not, be duly enforced. It would be an act of intolerance to refuse such protection. Tithes are secured to benefices, not only because there is an alliance between Church and State, but because they are the property of such benefices, and to refuse them would be robbery. Any possessions, which are matters of property, are secured to other religious or non-religious bodies on the same principle.

But what Locke, and Jeremy Taylor, and many other theorists, English and foreign, have said in favour of political toleration and religious liberty is not to be construed as advocating the absence of discipline and Articles of Faith within the boundaries of a single Church. As the Twentieth Article says—"The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith;" and in the judgment of Scripture, tradition, use, and reason, no external power has power to override this unquestionable right and duty. So to do would be moral, if not legal, persecution. CHRIST, leaving to the State

the duty of securing our temporal welfare, and generally ordering things temporal, has consigned to the Church the duty of securing our spiritual welfare, and eliminating false doctrines and unworthy persons. Excessive as was the pressure applied by sovereigns and Parliaments, while our Reformed Book of Common Prayer and Canons were in course of compilation, our Church can say in her Thirty-third Article—"That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto." Words are no longer signs of ideas, if such statements are reconcilable with that impatience of control, which leads men to sympathize with those who openly impugn the Catholic Faith in general, and the Anglican exposition of it in particular. The machinery which the Church can command for ensuring uniformity and unanimity is antiquated, dilapidated, impotent, and overlaid with legal and parliamentary incumbrances to a formidable extent; but the dream that she can remain thus hampered, while vital error maintains its lawless career unchecked, is a folly that the newly awakened self-consciousness of the Catholic Church in these realms is speedily and unanimously exploding.

The following sketch will show in how singularly unspiritual a manner our Church is protected from errors and irregularities, which originate with the clergy. More than a sketch is not needed in this place, as the whole Question of the Court of Final Appeal is discussed, at length, in another part of this volume.

Should a question arise about the legality of any doctrine or practice, in other words, if it be asked whether such practice or doctrine be tolerated or not, the manner of proceeding under the Clergy Discipline Act (the Act, be it remembered, of a body many of whose members are not Churchmen), is on this wise:—Some one, it matters not who, "promotes the office of judge by articles," and the judgment is for penal consequences against the defendant, involving suspension or deprivation. The Bishop of the diocese, on the application of the complainant, or of his own mere motion, issues a commission to five persons, (of whom his vicar-general, or an archdeacon, or rural dean within the diocese must be one,) to inquire into the grounds of the charge. Due notice having been given, the commissioners examine witnesses to ascertain whether there are *primâ facie* grounds for further proceedings. The result is filed in the registry. At this stage, the Bishop, with consent of all

parties, may pronounce sentence. Otherwise, articles are drawn up, and the accused in person, or by his counsel, appears before the Bishop to answer to them. If he admit the truth of them, the Bishop or his commissary may at once pass sentence upon him. If he does not admit their truth, the cause is heard by the Bishop and three assessors, and then sentence is pronounced. The first appeal is made to the Archbishop; the second to the Queen in Council, and is to be heard before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This Committee, it may be remarked in passing, affects some ill-defined claim to authority, derived in pretence from the Royal Supremacy, but in fact is a modern Civil Court, created by recent legislation. It is the creature of a statute, and deserves no more reverence from a claim to antiquity than the new County Courts. In such respect, the Courts of Queen's Bench, and Common Pleas, and the Exchequer are far more respectable. In appeals, when proceedings are conducted under the Clergy Discipline Act, Archbishops and Bishops, who are Privy Councillors, are members of the Committee. In all other appeals no ecclesiastics are members, although some Ecclesiastical proceedings are taken under the general law. Where this has been the case, ecclesiastics who were not members have been summoned to "attend the meeting." The punishments assigned by the Judicial Committee vary from a monition to supension *ab officio et a beneficio*, or even deprivation.

This short outline shows how less than shadowy is the spiritual power of the Church, even in courts which are nominally her own. The proceedings are regulated by Acts of Parliament, and there is an appeal from the Bishop and Archbishop to the King or Queen in Council. Moreover so imperfect is the administration of justice in these courts, from the inexperience or prejudice of the judges, who represent the Bishop and Archbishop, that their judgments are continually reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and the Catholic school of Churchmen have hitherto met with a fairer consideration of the principles which they advocate from this latter tribunal, than from those which more properly belong to the Church. The cases by which this assertion is established are so fresh in the memory of those who are interested in the subject, that it is superfluous to mention them in detail. It suffices to say that, if this Court of Appeal has shown a tendency to escape from pronouncing definite decisions, it has been a friend to the Church by legalizing some old Catholic customs, or at least leaving them undisturbed. Although this marked desire to leave all questions open, and the teachers of opposite doctrines equally unreproved,

shows how imperfect the existing provision is, still the bait of immediate advantage has allured many into a belief that it is better for the Church to leave the decision of her controversies in the hands of the Privy Council, than to hold them in her own. That a sudden and ill-considered change is to be deprecated, is an intelligible opinion; but that any one should be content to see the prerogative of the Church abandoned without a regret, is a proof that time and custom will habituate mankind to the most irrational of abuses. The indignation of S. Paul, who recoiled from litigation before an ordinary tribunal, may easily be imagined, if he were alive to see a natural function of the Church tamely surrendered, and the very hope of returning to the exercise of a constitutional right extinct in a Churchman's mind. With equal amazement would any member of the Primitive Church regard a negation of the principle, that it is for the Church to decide what latitude of opinion she will tolerate, and what she will not. Mosheim quotes S. Martin of Tours as saying:—"*Novum est et inauditum nefas ut causam ecclesiæ judex sæculi judicet.*" The judgment of the Mediæval Church would be to the same effect. The reins of government have of course been often wrested out of the Church's hand; but it was reserved for the Reformation in our own land to affirm the principle, that the Church plays a subordinate part in her own self-government, and accepts as an irresponsible arbiter of all her actions, an authority essentially political.

But even more important than the administration of the laws which affect Toleration, is the power that makes those laws. In this department the Church's vitality is as feeble as in the other. Especially when new cases arise, and the measure of Toleration has to be applied to doubtful tenets or practices, it is essential to have a power of legislation. In no other way can the Church defend herself from error. As a rule, she has always declared her mind on such points by Synods. The Papal claims are a violent intrusion. It was the function of a General Council to make Canons which controlled the whole Church; Provincial and Diocesan Synods made laws, to be observed within their respective limits. In our own country, two Provincial Synods were held in the reign of Edward VI. The Council of Nice decreed that two were to be regularly held in the course of the year; but their convention, in the lapse of time, fell into partial desuetude. They were employed for hearing complaints and making Constitutions. The Diocesan Synods were *mutatis mutandis* similar in nature. Here then the Church had a Constitutional machinery for settling disputed questions as they arose, and what was, and what was not,

to be tolerated was speedily defined. Convocations in England (to speak briefly on a somewhat complicated subject) were of two sorts, those which were the same as Synods, and those which met to tax themselves in addition to their proper functions. The latter took this form in the time of Edward I. They were tied down by Henry VIII. to make no Canon save with the royal assent. The same proviso was repeated in the eighth year of James I. In the time of Charles II. they made their last subsidy. From that time till A. D. 1700 they did little or nothing; in that year they sat, but still without any real vitality. They are now assembled and may proceed to act as Provincial Councils, when the Crown judges it to be expedient. If the Convocations of England and Ireland, better constituted as to their members and capacitated for joint action, freely received the requisite permission to make Canons, in them might be restored that Conciliar Power of the Church which is now indefinitely suspended.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which plays so important a part in the question of Toleration, being nominally the instrument of a higher power, it is necessary to speak briefly of the judicial authority of the Crown. The Synodical branch of it consists in determining controversies after the Convocation of the Church has considered them, the *judicium directivum* being in the Church, the *imperativum* in the King (Theophilus A. iii. 7). This throws immense power, in fact supreme power, into the Royal hands, for the declaration of what is orthodox and what is not. This seems a strange way of rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto GOD the things that are GOD's. The power, however, is thus modified. By the laws of England (1 Eliz. cap. i. A. D. 1558) "nothing is to be judged heresy but that which heretofore has been so adjudged by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or the first four General Councils, or some other General Council wherein the same hath been declared heresy by the express word of Scripture, or such as shall be termed heresy by the High Court of Parliament with the assent of the clergy in Convocation." But this modification does not much profit the Church; rather it strips her of efficient authority. If the existing laws are insufficient, there is no way in which she can freely and expeditiously supply what is required. Competition so ties the hands of all parties concerned, that any improvement, in the way of retrenching a superfluity or of supplying an omission, seems next to impossible. In fact heresy and irregularity either go unrebuked, or are restrained by an authority which has no right to meddle with ecclesiastical offences at all.

There is perhaps no subject on which the great divines of our

Church have written so inconclusively as that of the Royal Supremacy. They do not wish to appear Erastian, and therefore describe in sonorous phrases the spiritual independence of the Church; but they claim such prodigious collateral power for the Crown that it comes to nothing. Whether, if they lived in those days, they would transfer what they say of the Crown to the Houses of Parliament we can only conjecture, but to continue speaking in the same strain of the Regale in 1867 as in 1667 would be a great loss of time and labour. It is virtually extinct, and we are constantly threatened with short Acts to make Catholic practices illegal. Whether any one could look upon such Acts as emanating from the Queen, acting through her faithful Lords and Commons, it is difficult to say, but to do so would require a singularly constituted mind. The majority of English men would probably object to Parliament pretending to pass Canons, but as they also object to such an exercise of Synodal power with the assent of the Crown, they leave us to do as well as we can with our present shadowy Ecclesiastical Law, with all its Protean incongruities. In the mean time the limits of Toleration must retain their perplexing obscurity, doubly discreditable to a nation which prides itself on its administrative habits and sound common sense. Bishops will continue to shudder at the expensive prolixity of Ecclesiastical causes, Priests will tremble at the Damoclean sword of Parliament, the laity will enjoy their seductive licence; and all who are disposed to handle sacred things freely will go on skirmishing over the field of theology, while the avowed Rationalist stands by smiling at the confusion, and quoting the lines of his congenial Lucretius:—

> Suave mari magno, turbantibus æquora ventis,
> A terrâ alterius magnum spectare laborem.

We hear a great deal unwisely said about the evils of litigation by those who desire for our Sion peace at any price. It is a very natural wish for all, except the lawyers who practise in the Ecclesiastical Courts; but philosophically considered it has not much to commend it, as imprudent concessions sharpen the appetite of clamorous objectors, and often avert a battle at the cost of an internecine war. When laws are good, and the administration of them is in a state of efficiency, there can be no more profitable way of disposing of a controversy than arguing it out before a competent judge. It not only settles the matter for the time, but sets it at rest, more or less, for the future. Those who will not be content to abide by such decisions should by common

consent be condemned as undeserving of consideration. It is certainly unfortunate that this escape from the warfare, which through the renovated vitality of the Church has been threatening for the last quarter of a century, is not open to us. There is no confidence either in the law, or, what is far worse, in the administration of the law by the Judge. The old Canon Law, Canons passed since the Reformation, decisions of the Privy Council, and Acts of Parliament, come into frequent collision, and cause confusion. Gradual obsolescence contributes its share of perplexity. The ever-varying phases of thought, and novel contingencies, for which no foresight could have provided, add to the difficulty. The controversy now fermenting on the subject of "Ritualism" illustrates the vast chaos of contradiction into which the Church's rights and customs are plunged. The opinions of eminent counsel on both sides of the question, published in the course of last year, show by their contrarieties how difficult it is to come to a decision. The fact is, the Law was thoroughly disturbed and mutilated at the time of the Reformation, and it has never been adapted in a methodical manner to novel situations.

At the time of the Reformation, as it is well known, some attempt was made to reform and harmonize the Canons which had been in use in England. Cranmer and some other commissioners were appointed for that purpose by Henry VIII. and Edward VI. The work was finished, but through the King's death it remains unconfirmed to this day. Its title was *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, ex Authoritate primum Reg. Hen. VIII inchoata, deinde per Reg. Ed. VI. provecta.* Though wanting in validity, this collection is exceedingly interesting, and continues to remind us of the duty of the Church as to the discipline of her children, a duty which, through human perversity and continual obstructions, she so inadequately fulfils. It was not so in primitive times, when her Canons were binding on the clergy on pain of deprivation, and on the laity, of excommunication. Such was not the practice of Christians, when the words, "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican," had more than an antiquarian value.

If there is obscurity about the laws which limit the liberty of the clergy in things spiritual, what shall be said about Ecclesiastical discipline as affecting the laity? It seems very doubtful whether they are subject to any discipline whatsoever. In many books of Ecclesiastical Law it is roundly stated that laws made by Convocation do not bind the laity; and Lord Hardwicke, in a case in the year 1736, is cited as saying as much. It is certain that a clergyman refusing to communicate

a layman may be prosecuted, and if his reasons are not held sufficient, (and it is a matter in which it is very difficult to have reasons the sufficiency of which can be proved,) punished. Even our stringent statutes against apostasy, blasphemy, and irreverent behaviour, are practically disregarded, and the layman, whether for good or for evil, is left to his own devices. Others, however, will tell us that the Canons are part of the law of the land, and bind the laity as well as the clergy; while another authority says that even the clergy may break the greater number of them with impunity. It is thought by many, in spite of the rubric, that the *notorious offender* who may be repelled from Holy Communion, must first have been convicted by some legal sentence. It is evident how contrary this practical laxity is to the language of the Canons, which were certainly issued as binding on laity as well as clergy, and in which those guilty of various offences are declared *ipso facto* to be excommunicate; nay, this is the actual position of any one, lay or clerical, who denies that he is bound by the decrees of the sacred Synod of the nation. It is not too much to say that the discipline of the laity is a farce, and consequently that they are unaffected by the incidence of Toleration altogether.

The results of this laxity are to be deplored. It leaves heresy and disobedience wholly unchecked. Even the loyal Churchman sustains an injury from the absence of guidance in cases of difficulty. If he consults the clergy, they give him contradictory instructions as to what is exacted, allowed, or forbidden. He would, doubtless, wait with pleasure for the expression of the Church's mind, but he has no hope of being satisfied in this way. The oracles that should speak are virtually dumb, and he is left to commune with his own heart and be still; comforted, however, he may be, by the reflection that his mother, the Church, however hampered she may be, is a branch of the true Vine, and will ere long, with God's blessing, show herself to be a mother, and be able to educate her children. For many years, though outwardly patronized and flattered, she has been a captive, her privileges have been fetters of gold. She is now beginning to thirst for her primitive freedom, and to look not to man for the development of her powers, but to God.

One method, that has been adopted for the prevention of disputes about the measures of Toleration, is the exaction of assent to certain Articles of Religion, which, be it remembered, are Articles of Peace, rather than Articles of Faith, from those who take Holy Orders. Whatever may be thought of the Articles themselves which are imposed by the Church of England, the

principle, abstractedly, is a good one. It is a protection to all concerned; to a great extent it prevents extravagant opinions being broached, and extravagant restraint being imposed. It helps the clergy to know what latitude is tolerated and what is not; and certainly, as they sign the Articles with their eyes open, they cannot justly complain of injustice, if afterwards they find their hands are tied. They must remember that much freedom is secured to them touching things not mentioned in such Articles, for *primâ facie* what is not forbidden may be taken as allowed. Opinions and practices, adopted on the strength of this tacit permission, may not completely harmonize with the tendency of the Articles in question in the opinion of all, but, in spite of that, they rank among things *indifferent*, that is, neither commanded nor forbidden. Attempts have been made from time to time to substitute compliance with what is called the *spirit* of the Articles for compliance with the sense of the *words*. But this is very unreasonable, and foreign to the usual interpretation of official documents. If a man, on comparing his principles with the dicta of Articles, believes them to be compatible with those Articles, it is sufficient. It is strange that any other compliance should have been thought necessary by any who were conversant with the nature of agreements. It is difficult enough to obtain even a naked acceptance of two or three hundred propositions, and it is most unwise to increase the difficulty. Of course cases will occur in which, after due allowance for private judgment, one man may justly think that another has overstrained the permissible limits; but wherever there is a law and an active administration of law, such questions are soon solved.

That there should be ample opportunity of reconsidering Articles of Religion is of paramount importance, because it is beyond doubt that at certain times certain opinions, if not absolutely incorrect, assume a deforming prominence, detrimental to the analogy of the Faith. Our own Articles abundantly illustrate this assertion. There is in many of them a tone not altogether concordant with our Ritual Formularies. This arose from the natural reaction, during which the mind of our Church at the Reformation ran into a morbid repugnance to supposed error. The Articles of subscription were too minutely drawn up, and several propositions were included likely to lose their interest as time went on. But it is as essential to truth and peace that nothing unnecessary should be imposed, as it is that nothing necessary should be omitted. The imposition of any thing unnecessary is a fruitful cause of asperity and rebellion.

"In non necessariis libertas" is quite as sound a maxim as "in necessariis unitas," and it is high time to examine afresh, whether some modification is not required in our Articles, if the just medium is to be attained between a tyrannical stringency and a lawless Toleration. Bishop Jeremy Taylor truly says:— "In the division of hearts that is in the world, it is certain that some good men may dissent, and then either they shall be afflicted or be tempted to hypocrisy; of either of which if ecclesiastical laws be guilty, they are not for edification."

There is one self-ordained umpire on the *toleranda* of the Church, which, though its importance is of modern growth, in a short time has attained extravagant power. "Public Opinion" is supposed by many to have more right to criticize and limit the variations of Religious belief and practice than Church or State. There is nothing so abstruse or so sacred as to claim exemption from the crude *sic volo sic jubeo* of the British public. Of course this tribunal is a mere creation of the conceit of the nation, and its canons and sentences as shadowy and evasive as a Will-o'-the-wisp, but the Public Press gravely speak of it as if it were a substantial reality. Every self-constituted echo of the whims of the day declares to us what the imperial will of the many is not "going to stand," and what it is pleased to legalize. This irrational usurpation of judicial authority, although it is gratifying to see signs of the general interest taken in religious questions, discovers a formidable want of real intelligence, and an unscrupulous use of means in those who pander to the popular taste. Our journalists must know that most of their readers are wanting in the proper requisites for weighing truth; that they adhere, in spite of sober argument, to present impressions; that, according to the impetus given, they will blindly persecute the advocates of diametrically opposite propositions. If the majority of mankind were really in earnest about truth, they would be ashamed either to lead or to be led by such an irrational agency. One might have thought, if experience did not teach the contrary, that clever writers would have wished to correct the blind impetuosity of the public mind. They do so in some matters of social and political concern; but in religion the caprice of the multitude is still accepted as a judge from which there is no appeal, and the conduct of the people of Ephesus in the year 56 is apparently proposed as a model to Englishmen of the nineteenth century.

The object of these remarks has been to show that, from want of

laws in harmony with the times, and of a court truly Ecclesiastical to administer them, together with a general confusion of ideas as to the respective duties of Church and State touching religious questions, the limits of Toleration have been almost obliterated. It will be right in the next place to remind those who are interested in this important matter, of the effects of this want of system, as seen both from the point of view of those who are satisfied with things as they are, and of those whose earnest desire is to see the Church placed in a position of greater dignity and efficiency. Those who see nothing to condemn in the infinite irregularities which have prevailed during the last hundred years, complain of the introduction of several doctrines and practices which they consider ought not to be tolerated. For instance, it seems monstrous to many old-fashioned people that the clergy should arrogate to themselves the title of Priests, with the powers of absolving, consecrating, and blessing. They deem it an impertinence if a steward of the mysteries of the Gospel should rebuke a number of his flock for neglect or misapprehension of these mysteries. They resent any assertion of the right of the shepherd to warn his flock against schismatical acts and heretical opinions. They hardly allow him to arrange or beautify his church, or increase the number of his services. If he restores to activity rubrics which they declare to be obsolete, as, for instance, Baptism after the second lesson, or the notification of banns after the Nicene Creed, they resent it. If he endeavours to invest the most awful Act of public worship with due solemnity by means of music, and liturgical postures, and sacrificial vestments; if he presume to adopt a distinctive dress to remind others and himself of his sacred office; if, in fact, he does or says any thing beyond their own narrow experience, this class of which mention is here made is straightway offended, and charges those whose sin it is to have a conscience, with usurpation and disloyalty. If a Bishop's zeal flow in the same channel, and he support his clergy in the aforesaid or similar proprieties, his fate is the same; he is supposed to be guilty of principles and practices which Englishmen will never tolerate. It is much to be regretted that these anomalous Churchmen are not of the laity only; many Priests, or Ministers, as they prefer to be called, persist in maintaining that their brethren fail to preach the Gospel, and claim to themselves a monopoly of this awful commission. Some of this class, from inacquaintance with Holy Scripture and Church history, doubtless think in their hearts that their opponents teach what is not only beyond Toleration, but actually forbidden in the Church of England, in spite of the

testimony of Formularies, Rubrics, and Canons; others simply give the rein to their own unreasoning preferences, and make themselves the measure of the Toleration which they accord to others.

On the other hand, wherein do those who hold what are called, by a very honourable title, High Church principles, assert that their impugners overpass the bounds of reasonable freedom? In setting at nought the authority of Catholic testimony, although the Church to which they belong professes itself Catholic to the innermost core; in espousing the loose principles of a system, visionary where it is not heretical, called Protestantism, which even Churchmen as modern as our Reformers do not recognize; in denying the attachment of sacramental grace to Ordination, empowering the ordained to perform priestly acts; in overlooking the self-existence of the Church before, and in some sense above, all human institutions; in breaking the plain letter of the Church's law, as expressed in her Rubrics, Canons, and Formularies; in explaining away Regeneration in Baptism, a Real Objective Presence in the Eucharist, a Divine Gift in Confirmation, Forgiveness in Absolution, Grace in other Sacraments; and generally in neglecting or despising Festivals and Fasts, Holy Places and Holy Persons, and other Church institutions. These principles, they maintain, are stamped indelibly on all the title-deeds of the Church of England, and they declare that those who set them at nought have placed themselves beyond the bounds of reasonable Toleration.

The mutual accusations of these two adverse schools give a fair idea of the actual liberty taken, if not allowed, in the English Church. It is a liberty truly that is not far removed from absolute licence. Let us illustrate it a little further. In one church it may be taught that the Sacred Presence in the Holy Eucharist is Real and Objective, in the next that the Presence is merely a figure of speech; consequently, at this Altar may be seen Priest, censer, candles, and chasuble—at that Table, Minister, surplice, and hood; here is a well-carved font—there a common basin; this pulpit resounds with sacramental grace and obedience—that with faith without works and sensible conversion; one temple echoes with the solemn chant and pealing anthem—in another is heard the solitary twang of the parish clerk; here are storied windows and elaborate screen—there are white-washed walls and ordinary glass. But it is needless to elaborate a comparison, the items of which are known to all; it is only necessary to add that the penurious plainness and costly ornament are both adopted on principle, and respectively

preferred as expressions of genuine piety. There are of course thousands of churches in which a medium prevails, but the extremes, and the vast distance between them, are now the matters in point. Both types of worship cannot surely be right. If one is according to the tenour of Holy Scripture, the tradition of the Church, and the instincts of Religion, the other must be as adverse to the ideal perfection as to its opposite, and yet both co-exist unrestrained under the protection of a Toleration which defies the Horatian maxim—

> Est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines,
> Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum.

It would be unbecoming in an individual member of so vast a body as the Church to speak dictatorially of the principles and practices within and without the pale of Toleration; that would be the business of a properly constituted Synod, deciding on questions as they arose. But an Essay on the subject would hardly be intelligible, without specimens of the application of the general law of Toleration to particulars. There must be many points on which, without being indifferent, we may admit a liberty of opinion to others. A Church which pursued its dictation to all minutiæ would soon empty itself of all its adherents. No doubt there exists a tendency to intolerance in all earnest minds; but it is the merit of Conciliar decisions, which are the joint products of many minds, to curb this individual impatience of contradiction. For instance, touching the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, so long as it was admitted that they were written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the theory of a "verbal inspiration" might be left a matter of choice. As to the salvation of one who denies the Catholic Faith, it might be wise to affirm something less stringent than—or at least to state with some explanatory or qualifying clause—that "without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." As to the administration of Baptism, it might be well not to tie it down to the "minister of the parish or any other lawful minister;" in the administration of the Holy Eucharist, it seems a palpable inconvenience to forbid Reservation, or other wide-spread and long-established usages, such as the Elevation of the Host, the mixed Chalice, Incense, Lights, and Vestments; to require "three at the least" to communicate with the priest; touching the doctrine of this Sacrament, to appear to favour Consubstantiation to the exclusion of Transubstantiation, by judging positively of the mode of the Presence, and the remanence of the natural elements, or to con-

fine, contrary to Catholic custom, the word "Sacrament" to the two chief Sacraments of the Gospel.

It is pleasing to find that the possibility of alterations, such as those which this increased latitude might require, are foreseen and allowed in the first sentence of the Preface to the Prayer Book:—"It is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of authority should from time to time seem necessary or expedient." Many of the causes of previous alterations are equally in existence now, such as deficiency in forms suitable for special occasions, use of phrases liable to misconstruction, and insufficient direction of them that are to officiate. As to the last point, it must be confessed that provision for some essential acts in performing Divine service is totally omitted, while more than one contradictory rubric is to be found. The Preface concludes with words which point out the proper authority to which recourse is to be had, when alterations have to be made:—"We have good hope that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocation of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England." It is singular that the mushroom Resolution of the Upper House of Convocation, passed on the 13th of February last, and accepted in a mutilated form by the Lower House, virtually invites the clergy to depart from that very scheme of Ritual, which Convocation originally authorized and hoped would be readily embraced. The Bishops should bear in mind that as they quote a Rubric, which forbids them to order any thing contrary to the contents of the Book of Common Prayer, they are themselves bound to conform to the letter and spirit of the Rubric.

But in order to show how many things there are, concerning which it may be said by one school or another, that they ought to be tolerated, mention of some additional points shall be made, in which at the present time it would seem unwise to enforce uniformity; it is necessary to say *at the present time*, as our position, temper, and capabilities, as a Church, fifty years hence may be exceedingly different from what they are now. Surely it should be allowable in times of sickness or confusion, or in remote places where the requisite assistance or appliances are not to be had, to perform the ordinary and occasional Services in a manner widely different from that advisable under other circumstances, e. g., in well-administered parishes, in cathedrals,

or University chapels. It cannot be wise to order what cannot be observed, or to forbid elements of stateliness and beauty, which, when they may be had, the dignity of Divine service, or the zeal of the faithful make morally indispensable. If "such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof," as were in use "in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth" are proper for a London parish, are they to be equally imperative in a poor outlying hamlet, where through a want of Priests, or local poverty, it is difficult to maintain even occasional services? Surely in such cases some departure from a stereotyped usage is to be tolerated; and if so, the amount of departure should be indicated, as far as is possible, by authority. If necessity prevents any thing beyond the barest elements of ritual and ceremonial in one place, favourable circumstances elsewhere may admit those solemn accidents of grandeur, which Scripture, tradition, and the customs of Christendom admit, or rather require. At present there is but one law for all, and there is no indication that the least departure from it will be tolerated. The stringency as to usages is like that signified in the declaration prefixed to the Articles:—"We will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree." But if Toleration is indispensable in certain cases, it must be Toleration regulated by some inspiration more trustworthy than the crude caprice of individuals.

But to continue the present rapid review of usages which it would be unwise either to enforce or forbid, there may be instanced the admission in certain cases of a less number than three godparents, Baptism being often deferred from the difficulty of finding so many; the use of chrism at Confirmation, and on some other occasions; communicating the sick by means of Reserved Elements; anointing the sick, as is customary both in the West and the East, not only, however, when the case is desperate, but before; the celebration of Holy Communion at marriages and funerals; enriching the Burial service with sundry instructive Catholic ceremonies now fallen into disuse; and perhaps the symbolical use of water, which has been blessed, on entering and leaving Churches. To pass on to doctrines, or the corollaries from doctrines, after what has been said of late about the *Filioque* controversy, and the necessity of avoiding needless collision with the Holy Eastern Church, is it wise to rank the Athanasian Creed with the two others, or to place the three great Creeds on one and the same dogmatic level? Is there not, to say the least, some want of perspicuity about the doctrine of Justification by faith; and should not statements, more obviously harmonious with the words of S. James on

Justification by works, be tolerated? In the Articles about the Sacraments we find the Sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist omitted. Should not a statement of this truth be tolerated? Must the doctrine of the mystery in the Holy Eucharist be stated so as to imply some sort of Consubstantiation? Might not a form of expression which has less appearance of doubt about a Substantial Presence (the word being used in the philosophical, not in the popular sense) be allowed? Are we bound for ever to read the books of Homilies in public? Is a less Tudor-like statement of the Royal Supremacy inadmissible, one for instance to the effect, that the Church may administer her own affairs in her own way, so long as she does not defy the laws of the land? Is the device by which the privileges taken from the Bishop of Rome at the Reformation devolved upon the Crown to be for ever maintained?

The above-mentioned are points in which our present Ecclesiastical system leaves little or no margin for diversity of practice, or opinion, but there is still much supplementary matter, asking at the least for toleration, if not for a greater measure of favour. If there is no machinery for supplying with full authority missing Offices for the Ritual portion of our Book of Common Prayer, there might still be some provisional toleration for Forms of minor authority, e. g., simpler Offices for Missions, shorter forms for daily Celebration, Matins, and Evensong, with ordinary Compline for week-days and solemn Vespers for Sundays and Holy Days. Some Service specially adapted to children seems also to be required; and proper Services for Harvest, and Offices of Benediction. Rites especially impressive seem required for Good Friday, such as the *Improperia* or Reproaches, the Devotion of the Three Hours Agony, and the *Missa Presanctificatorum*, and other High days require observances of a more distinctive and Catholic character. Minor Orders, Sisterhoods, and Confraternities, are gradually rising in esteem; these want their Offices, regulation, and legislation. A modified Toleration of such would perhaps beneficially precede a higher degree of official approbation. But suggestions, which to some may appear to be revolutionary, need not be further extended. Many things may have been omitted, which to others may seem much more important; such, were they recorded, would only tend to the same conclusion, that while some things are now tolerated which might profitably be forbidden, others might be allowed which our present ecclesiastical discipline, either in spirit or letter, forbid. The limits of Toleration, from whatever point of view we judge, seem to require rectification. The tone of this Essay has

of course been that of what is called the Catholic School, but it is much to be wished that the whole body of our brethren should be fairly treated, and all should be prepared to suffer to some extent, rather than witness a protracted reign of that irregularity, with its confusion, dissensions, uncertainties, and stagnation, which legislative and judicial paralysis in the Church involves.

Some adherents of this last-mentioned School, though they have been much more scrupulous than their opponents in observing law and respecting authority, have been roundly charged with multiplying intolerable innovations. But supposing for a moment that the charge is true, which it is not, what could be greater temptation to extravagance than our present want of all definite clearness on the subject of this paper? They are striving with much self-sacrifice to increase the power of Religion over their countrymen of all classes; a portion of their method is distasteful to another party in the Church; these opponents peevishly cry out that their practices ought not to be tolerated, and vex them with petty annoyance. Farther than this matters seldom proceed, though sometimes there is a wearisome law-suit, which either ends in nothing or in strengthening the hands of the so-called "innovators." This is not the way to encourage a conciliatory spirit. Unquestionably the existence of this fruitless war exposes the serious disorganization of the Church. Accused persons should be brought to the bar, and be allowed to defend themselves, and then treated according to their merits or demerits. Let them be attacked legally and equitably, or not at all. No impediment to truth-loving controversy is intended; *that* would proceed collaterally, and if tempered with charity, would throw light upon the points in question. That rougher tactics prevail, is not altogether the fault of the combatants; but, it must be repeated, the chaotic state of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the obscurity of Canonical Law, the usurpations of the civil power, contempt for theoretical principles, and two centuries of lethargic inaction. Suppose that the Church had not only power to make laws but also authority to execute them, and that the State interfered with this process only as it interferes with other Religious bodies, then differences would be settled with due rapidity, and if false steps were taken, there would be an opportunity of retracing them.

How this same cachectic state of the Body prevents its self-purification, we have all seen in our own lifetime. It is not necessary to retail old grievances; the latest case of all, that of the *Essays and Reviews*, showed that either the judges concerned were, from incompetency, unable to master what the law of the Church is, which it would be ungracious to assert, or that from the paucity or

obscurity of her documents, or both, it was impossible to discover what the mind of the Church was, and is, as to Inspiration and the other points in question. The case of Dr. Colenso, which shows such general ignorance as to the value of Letters Patent, the relation of the Church in the Colonies to the Church at Home, and the jurisdiction of Metropolitans, affords a more conclusive proof than any other that there is "something rotten in the state of Denmark." Our own anomalies are reproduced in our own Dependencies, and Colonial Governments seem no better aware how they ought to respect Ecclesiastical decisions, when carefully considered and solemnly pronounced. All this tends to show that the true mean of Toleration between excess and defect has yet to be learned, together with its application ever varying with the novel exigencies of the day.

How far, and under what conditions, the laity should have a voice in regulating the limits of Toleration, is a subject of profound interest. It is one of the commonest defences of Parliamentary interference, that in this manner the voice of the laity is heard; heard it certainly is, and, perhaps, a little too clearly, inasmuch as the decisions of Parliament, if exercised, are final. But this exercise of lay influence is too accidental, too novel, and too dictatorial. It has not the sanction of the Church, which would justly prefer to receive lay co-operation, if at all, in a less humiliating manner. Indeed it is in no sense co-operation, but independent action, either before or after the Church's action. This is a subject which it is difficult for the clergy to treat, from their lying open to the suspicion of seeking excessive power for themselves. There is undeniably a temptation to do this; but still the existence of this temptation ought not to interfere with the question of abstract right. The objections to the laity having a co-ordinate voice with the Priesthood are simply the impropriety of their deciding on matters on which they have no authority to decide, and the danger, to say the least, of departing from primitive, Apostolic, and once universal custom. It is true that the laity, equally with the clergy, form a portion of the Church, and are equally interested in her welfare; but it is also true that the same commission and responsibility have not been entrusted to them both. This has always been the belief of the Church from the earliest times. In the beginning, Presbyters alone sat with Bishops both in Consistorial and Provincial Councils; in fact, in connexion with the Bishops, they formed the Ecclesiastical Senate. S. Ignatius calls upon the Trallians to obey them as they would obey the Apostles themselves.

The Preface to the Articles assigns to the clergy in their Convocation the duty of dealing with doctrinal questions and making Canons, subject to Royal approbation, while, as is natural, the State has regulated the Church's temporalities. It would be impossible for the clergy to forego their superiority in spiritual things without abandoning their peculiar mission, and failing in those prophetical and administrative duties which Scripture and tradition have always declared to be theirs. The Gospels and Epistles provide the foundation on which the permanent superstructure has been raised. The stewards of the mysteries of the Gospel, who are the guides of men through the dangerous mazes of life, could not exercise their ministry, if they must teach and govern at the dictation of others; and yet some counterpoise to ecclesiastical supremacy is required; probably sufficient would be found in general un-official pressure from without, and the free and extended use of consultative assemblies, in which lay opinions would be made known, preparatory to the legislative Synods of the clergy.

No language can exaggerate the importance of re-engaging the interest of the laity, as much as possible, in the welfare of the Church, and of diverting them from unhealthy activity by giving them a constitutional sphere, in which they may work profitably to the general Body. But after all, the preservation of the balance of power between clergy and laity, supposing that it were ever so well devised, must always be a delicate matter. It may be compared to that between man and wife. The husband and father is responsible for the government and well-being of the family, and yet the wife and mother should not be a nonentity. But the discrimination of their spheres cannot be definitely drawn; the influence of the one upon the other can only be a matter of tact, undefined and insensible, *hoc, quale nequeo monstrare ac sentio tantum.* It is so with the clergy and laity. Their relation cannot be so much a matter of law and definition, as of mutual consideration and affection, free from jealousies and usurpation. But if this *entente cordiale* is broken, and one side must submit to the other, in either case, there can be little doubt from which side the ultimate concession must come.

This subject belongs to the discussions of Toleration, because it concerns the question, Who is to decide on the limits of Toleration? Surely the clergy in their Synods and Courts, primarily, directly, and responsibly, and the laity by their general influence, indirectly and non-officially. The same sort of collateral assistance would be obtained from sister Churches,

if Christendom were not so unhappily divided. What is allowed, forbidden, and demanded, elsewhere? is a natural and thoroughly Christian question. The doctrine of Unity enjoins it. Moreover, when we reflect that Toleration presupposes a certainty as to the essentials of Christianity, we begin to see that its exercise involves the necessity of General Councils. Indeed the use of these can never be superseded, until the Church ceases to be Militant. As things now exist, although providentially the great dogmas of the Faith have been fixed by this agency, perplexing doubts must arise as to the inference or non-inference of other truths from those which have been accounted fundamental. It cannot be otherwise. If it cannot be said of one or two Councils, that they were sufficient, neither can it be said of a hundred. Such Councils are the only ultimate Court of Appeal which can fully satisfy the Christian mind, and nothing can be conceived beyond them but a supplementary revelation. Such an agency is of course impossible at present, but as it is the remedy for dissension to which our Church has always professed to look forward, so it is the one which most thoroughly coincides with the theory and history of the Catholic society. It is a grievous mistake not to look forward hopefully to such a consummation, distant though it may be. Universal experience has sufficiently proved that such projects are never realized, unless the way has been paved by a general desire, a desire often arising from a germ of hope apparently little likely to be fulfilled. We find this in temporal matters; but surely we have reason to believe that Providence will hasten an event so beneficial to the Church, if we do not in our blindness assume that what seems improbable to us is really impossible. Year by year we witness national revolutions which never entered into the speculations of statesmen. It is at least as probable that changes of which our philosophy had never dreamed, should take place in the Church. Perhaps some of those who are sighing for the *rapprochement* of the various members of the Catholic family may not have duly considered this consequence of Unification. They may have been content to regard such an event as fitting and beautiful, without looking to it for authoritative decisions on the limits of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, knowledge and opinion, faith and free inquiry. But if infallibility can be found any where upon earth, no one will deny that it must be sought in the deliberate judgment of a Synod of the whole Catholic Church; no other opportunity can be conceived when the scattered elements of truth, specially preserved by particular Churches, could be brought together, and recemented into one consistent whole. Over such a representative Assembly

of the entire Church the Holy Spirit would preside, realizing the words of the poet—

"Totos infusa per artus,
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet."

We have no reason to despair. "I have reserved to Myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." The Catholic Church has no special difficulties in the way of forming correct judgments on questions of Toleration, truth, and order, save those of its own creating. The Holy Scriptures, with an amazing amount of exegetical literature, are before us. The treasures of traditional knowledge, beginning from the earliest times, have come down to us. If we have not learned by this time how the rights of the Church and of the World affect each other in civil and social contact, we never shall learn. The number of possible heresies must at this date be nearly exhausted, and the growing impatience at long-endured divisions is more than superficial. These aids are of vast value, and if it were not for the impediments which we throw in our own way, the course would be clear. It rests with those Elijahs who see that perplexities arise from human folly, chiefly pride, and avarice, and ambition, to awaken the whole Catholic Church to a love of wisdom, and truth, and union. If Churches would respect each other, if Christians loved each other more, if there were no unseemly rivalries between Church and State, the advantages which have been mentioned would come into play, and if perfection were not attained, at least a Reformation more worthy of the name than any commotion which we have yet had, would be the result. But for all this we must wait. Christians are still far too much enamoured of trivialities to leave the lower level of paltry, present interests for the higher one of permanent Catholic prosperity. And why should we not wait? "Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain;" the Church has had the early rain in Apostolic times, and it may have the latter rain now. Is the prophet wrong who from the summit of his Carmel salutes the little cloud, no bigger than a man's hand? We know how the sentence of individual excommunication, which so many have passed against themselves, is being lightened, and how the Sacraments are being restored gradually to their proper estimation. It is surely something more than possible, that particular Churches will ere long communicate in the Sacrament of Unity, and take common counsel to discover what is not tolerable in doctrine and discipline, and purge

out of herself all traitors and treasons which have crept in unawares.

In the mean time Churchmen would be wise if they gradually weaned themselves from expectation of temporal protection and privileges, and contented themselves with the greater blessings of freedom and justice. Theoretically speaking, Toleration is the best condition for the Catholic Church. By this word is meant not only an immunity from persecution and disabilities, but a permission from the Sovereign Power to carry out her institutions according to her own conscience, and such protection of her property as any other corporation may claim. Nothing less will satisfy Catholic believers. The Church *cannot surrender* a right, or a dogma, even were she solicited so to do, for the sake of advantages, however great. She may not do so—she has not the power. States may mould themselves as they like; they may institute, abrogate, be monarchical, aristocratic, or democratic, and in every way study the temporal advantage of their constituents, but such a course is forbidden to the Church by the charter of her existence. She is either a Divine Society, responsible to a Divine Founder and Head for the use of talents committed to her, and acting continuously in His Name, or else the claims which she has ever put forth are simply blasphemous. She pretends to be governed by the Holy Ghost, to open and shut, to punish transgressors, to absolve penitents from their sins, to feed the faithful with supernatural food, to regenerate and bless in the name of God, to ordain her officers with a form of words which is either warrantable or transcendently presumptuous, to place her children under the charge of Bishops and Priests mediately ordained by Christ, and to contribute to the welfare of souls when this world shall be no more.

In claiming all these responsibilities, she assigns to herself a dignity compared with which that of the most exalted institution of the earth is as nothing. Granting that the power of the State is of Divine appointment, it cannot pretend to the direct and detailed intervention which is the very life of the Church. There is a gulf, as wide as that which separated Lazarus and Dives, between the spheres, characters, and objects of the two powers. The one is of the earth, earthy, the other is of Heaven, Heavenly; the one is subject to the shifting caprices of man, the other has a creed and a code which are immutable; the one only professes to secure temporal rights and to protect person and property, the other is God's agent for uniting man to Himself, and conveying body and soul to a state of everlasting felicity. These expressions may seem to be high-flown or not, but the very

minimum of truth contained in them shows a difference of nature between the Spiritual and Temporal power, which makes such an alliance between the two as would mutilate or paralyze the latter, an act of sacrilege.

The above remarks are of a general nature; but this could hardly be avoided from the nature of the subject. The number of individual opinions and acts, concerning which it could be asked—"Is this tolerated?" or—"Ought this to be tolerated?" are infinite. The theorist can only lay down principles which, when apart from their application, often seem so plain that they hardly need to be stated. The primary truth to be acknowledged is this—That the limits of Toleration are left in such profound obscurity, that the most obedient son of the Church cannot distinctly tell whether he is conforming to her mind or not. Our practical inquiry, consequently, ought to be—How can that happy condition be realized, in which a Christian will not be perplexed as to his faith or practice, a heretic will not be allowed to undermine the orthodoxy of his neighbours, and a faithful believer will not be persecuted for maintaining what his Church does not forbid? It seemed more profitable to try to answer such questions, than to catalogue prosecutions, or to tabulate all possible varieties of opinion, which are compatible or incompatible with fundamental soundness. It is not a wearisome apparatus of rigorous dogmatic assertions on every possible point that is required, but machinery readily available to decide, *pro re nata*, what tenet or custom is allowable, and what is not. The class of things indifferent, and therefore optional, should unquestionably be large; but, at the same time, when doubts arise, the solution of them should be prompt. That grave abuses now prevail, is beyond all doubt; but if the progress of the now-spreading Catholic Reformation continues, and men learn to study truth more and victory less, then what we desire may be realized, and some of that thick fog be dissipated which has hung so long and so injurioulsy over the boundaries of Religious Toleration.

Maxwell Julius Blacker.

Church Music.

"Facilis est descensus averni; sed revocare gradum, hoc est opus." This is one of the rules of life's grammar; a rule, the truth of which we seldom recognize till we are staggered by the difficulties attending the "opus revocandi."

The present state of Church Music in this country supplies us with an apt example to this rule. A quarter of a century has now been spent in endeavouring to restore "the service of song in the House of the Lord;" and yet, in spite of the efforts of a host of able and devoted Church musicians, the Church of England has done little more than realize the difficulties which the previous two centuries, or more, of torpid indifference have entailed upon her. The Church's Song is, even yet, scarcely distinguishable in a chaos of conflicting sounds, and the truth of the due celebration of her ritual has not yet found a resting place amidst the strife of tongues.

The efforts of the Church Music revivalists of the last five-and-twenty years seem to have been for the most part confined to Matins, Litany, and Evensong, while, generally speaking, the Eucharistic Office has received little attention. It is well, perhaps, to assume that it appeared desirable to begin with those services with which English people, unfortunately, were musically most familiar, and which the Church orders to be sung or said daily and thrice weekly; and thus to train the mass of worshippers to apply the true principles of Christian worship to their noblest object. And it will be convenient here to take this view of the matter without pausing to discuss its correctness.

Doubtless there are, at the present time, Churches where, as concerns the Music of the Church, all is "done decently and in order;" but in how many has an undue elaboration, an excess of artistic endeavour, turned the choir into performers, and the congregation into an audience. In how many more do showy Anthems, and florid Chants, intricate Services, and ornate Kyries form a strange and painfully grotesque contrast to a careless and irreverent gabble of Confession, Creeds, Lord's Prayer, and Responses. How often has the "new cloth" of an inconsiderate revival of ancient, and perhaps laudable custom in the rendering of some parts of the service, made "the rent worse,"

because prematurely sewn on to the "old garment" of neglect in all the other parts! How often do we see "a thing of shreds and patches," instead of a figure clothed in a comely garment, woven throughout of the same material, displaying congruity in its different folds, and harmony in the contrast of its lights and shadows!

To suppose that the dull, clay-cold monotony of an irreverent choir and an apathetic congregation, broken at intervals by a startling canticle, an elaborate anthem, or an intricate introit, is the realization of the Church's Song, is a delusion akin to that of the savage, who fancies that he has adopted European costume, because he has arrayed his otherwise bare blackness in a cocked hat, and a pair of boots, the gift of some friendly trader.

And, in truth, many of the so-called musical services of the present day exhibit strange incongruities—e. g.—Canticles sung in chorus, instead of being chanted antiphonally; congregations often apparently unaware that the chanting of Psalms and Canticles should be antiphonal; some Canticles sung, while others are read by the officiating minister and the clerk; the Sanctus sung as an introit, and afterwards read at the Celebration which it has preceded; Morning Service, jubilant with anthem, chants, and hymns, followed by a Communion Service, read coldly throughout; a metrical hymn introduced before the sermon, while the Nicene Creed, the appointed hymn before the sermon, is scarcely heard; the versicles and suffrages read in the ordinary tones of ever-varying individual expression, and their respective responses chanted in full harmony; the treble part of Tallis' harmonized responses, supposed to be the ancient Church tone, and used accordingly; which motley list, imperfect as it is (for these are but a few specimens of a large stock of oddities), may be crowned by the fact that English Churchmen are now mystified by the appearance of more than one *Book of Common Praise*, although it is certain that 'Praise' occupies a very great portion of their "Book of Common Prayer"—and equally certain that 'Prayer' must occupy a considerable portion of these *Books of Common Praise*.

All these anomalies and incongruities make it evident that the term "Church Music" conveys different ideas to different people. Some look upon Church Music as an extraneous addition to the services of our Book of Common Prayer, an addition often desirable, but yet to be made or not, according to circumstances. Others take the terms "Church Music" and "Church Service" to mean one and the same thing; they believe that however simple the manner of using the ritual of our Church, that "use"

must be a musical use. Doubtless the latter are right, and doubtless too, that a true view of the matter will show that the two parties may be, in some measure, virtually agreed, and differing only in definitions.

And here we come to the plain fact, viz., that there are not two kinds of service, a "read service" and a "musical service;" for the service of the Church is to be "said or sung:" but whether said with the utmost simplicity, or sung with the greatest elaboration, it is essentially musical, and Church Music is its necessary expression. Conversation-tone, ordinary reading tone, however impressive, is not the appointed expression of the Church's public offices, nor will Church Music ever again be what it ought to be till this truth is admitted and acted upon.

With these propositions as our starting point we will take a sketch of the different manners of celebrating Divine Service which differently circumstanced congregations require, and show that "*saying*" or "*singing*"—the latter only a development of the former—is adapted to every case. And this will be done without special reference to the earlier periods of the Church's history; for the true expression of Christian common worship is essentially the same in all ages.

To trace the Music of the Church to its origin, on the day when the first antiphonal chant was sung by those who by their baptism in the Red Sea, and deliverance from Egyptian bondage were consecrated to be the Israel of GOD; to watch the Music of the Church in its Jewish cradle, to describe its development during the ages of the yet undivided Christendom, is not the object of the present Essay. This has been so often done, and so well done, that it would be needless to repeat it, or to do more than to apply the truth of all times to the present and past celebration of the Offices of our Book of Common Prayer.

In the Divine Worship of our Church, the officiating minister recites certain parts of the service by himself, and he also reads more or less of Holy Scripture in the Lessons, Epistles, Gospels, and other appointed portions. If he did nothing more than this, he would not of necessity do any thing essentially musical, for he would speak by himself; but there are also the LORD'S Prayer, Confessions, Creeds, and other forms appointed to be said or sung by the Priest and the people together. Further, our Offices contain Canticles and Psalms to be sung antiphonally by the two portions into which every congregation is divided, or said alternately by minister and congregation. And lastly, there are Prayers, Collects, Versicles, and Suffrages, to each of which

the congregation has its prescribed answer, which answer varies in length, from the longer responses down to the "Amen," the shortest response of all.

The bulk, therefore, of the acts of prayer and praise in our services consists, 1, of those which the Priest and people repeat or recite together; and 2, those in which the Priest's sentence or sentences are followed by a congregational response. The due delivery of these forms an essentially musical act: for if a body of voices, recite simultaneously a prescribed form of words, they will, instinctively, adopt the same tone of voice; that tone will be a distinct tone; and such recitation will be a musical expression of the form prescribed.

Doubtless a congregation may unite in the use of a prescribed form, and in so doing, exhibit a low confused murmur, while each adopts the varied inflections of voice which characterize indistinct and imperfect utterance; and facts show that such is very often the case. But this is not the utterance which the Church calls for. She requires that all worshippers should, as with one voice, distinctly and clearly, give an evident outward sign of the oneness of heart of which their acts of prayer and praise are the expression. And when this is done, the human vocal instinct asserts its power, and a general unity in tone and pitch is the result.

Let a congregation, assembled to worship in the manner prescribed by our Church, recite as with one voice the portions appointed for them; let each voice be lifted up, so that individual utterance is absorbed in the mass of an united delivery. Who could ignore the music of such worship? Who could hear the bright clear line of sound, the colossal expression of each holy sentence in Creed and Canticle, in Confession and Psalm, and not recognize the truth that united vocal utterance is essentially musical? He must be a sorry organist who could not frame an accompaniment to such a song. No one who has tasted such "old wine" would desire the "new wine" of modern tradition; none who have fed on such "bread" would be satisfied with the "husks" of the confused murmurs, the uncertain whisperings, or the apathetic silence which characterize what is called, in these days, "a read service."

Many a devout worshipper, desirous of showing that he was sincere when, to the words—"O LORD, open Thou our lips," he had answered—"And our mouth shall show forth Thy praise," would gladly lift up his voice in the congregation, were he not frozen into silence by the Gorgon gaze of those about him, whose looks of stolid wonder seem to say—"What is he doing?"

How easy for such an one to offer his sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving, if he felt that his individual voice was lost in the sound of the voices around him. What a help would each be to the other, if all, as members of the "one body," thus exercised the privilege which they enjoy in virtue of the Presence of their Divine Head in the earthly sanctuary, and as a testimony to the Presence of His glorified Humanity at the right hand of the throne of GOD. And what a proof would thus be given that Church Music should be inseparable from Church Service.

But, that congregations may thus say or sing, one thing is indispensable—they must be efficiently and intelligently led. A clerk, or clerks, competent, by the acquirement of a distinct and educated delivery, to guide and direct the body of worshippers, is the Church's own appointment. Experience shows the wisdom of her order, and certifies its necessity. At the time when one clerk was considered to be sufficient, only few persons in the generality of congregations could read; but now, when the few are they who cannot read, no doubt more than one clerk will often be required.

Here, while the Priest so speaks that all may distinctly answer, and the clerk, or clerks, so lead that all may join with them, is exhibited the simplest manner in which a congregation in the most remote district, may use the appointed services of our Book of Common Prayer. And in this "use" Church Music appears in its elementary form, as the germ from which may come the buds and flowers of a higher musical expression.

So then, beginning at the beginning, we have before our view what may be any where realized: for in the most secluded and unpropitious districts, a clerk, really deserving the name, may be found; or if not there to be found, may be trained; or if there be no trainable material, may surely, in these days, be imported.

Perhaps in some places, owing to the force of peculiar circumstances, the manner of use may be limited to this, the simplest form of Church Music. Clear, reverent, and suitable delivery, united and distinct congregational utterance, with perhaps a metrical hymn to relieve the simplicity of the most unadorned effort that assembled worshippers can make, may be all that can be done. Thus far they may go, and no further, if circumstances so compel;—yet even here, in this, the most modest of all modest Plain Song, is the foundation and ground-work of all Choral Service. If this be wanting, no more elaborate superstructure should be raised; if this be realized, more will sooner or later be called for.

And now that we have taken a view of Church Music in its elementary form, we can go on to trace its growth and development.

However clear it may be that the true method of saying Divine Service involves unity of tone, and the same pitch of voice, it can scarcely be expected that entire monotony should long characterize the whole. The voice will deepen in acts of supplication; there will be a tendency to raise its tone in order to express the transition from the petition, "O LORD, open Thou our lips," to the first Gloria Patri; in the Canticles and Psalms, Priest and people will often burst the bonds of simple recitation, the Belief will be outspoken as a great hymn of praise; the following Preces will, from their very nature, suggest some such inflection of voice as may more vividly express their meaning, and prevent that excess of rigidity which an unvarying utterance of Versicle and Response would exhibit. All this will more or less appear wherever the voice is the due expression of the heart's devotion.

Now what is all this but a description of the ancient traditional Church Tones, the noble Plain Song of the Church Catholic, as used in the daily order of Matins and Evensong? And a similar treatment applied to "the Order for the Administration" of the Holy Communion, the Litany, and other Offices, would be a like description of the "uses[1]" which have long prevailed in the manner of saying or singing these services. Vocal instinct, guided by devout feeling, had for ages led to the adoption of such "use" in the manner of celebrating Divine Service. In different dioceses, it is true that, to a certain extent, different uses prevailed: uses differing in minor details, yet alike in general character; all of them the results of a recognition of the truth of Church Music in its simplest form; all of them, too, the effects of that "spirit of grace and of supplications" which could not every where be restrained within the limits of a bare and uninflected recitation. And these "uses" are thus recognized in that part of the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer entitled, "Concerning the Service of the Church," which stands thus:—"And whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this Realm; some following Salisbury Use, some Hereford Use, some the Use of Ban-

[1] The word "Use" referred, no doubt, primarily and chiefly, to the actual contents of the Office Book, but there is sufficient evidence that it also referred to the manner of singing or saying the service, to justify its appropriation in this and following pages.

gor, some of York, and some of Lincoln; now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use."

The original Preface in the Book of 1549 had already virtually expressed what was thus set forth more than a century later; and it was at that time the work of John Marbeck to strike with his trident the floating island of various uses, and to enrich the sixteenth century with the terra firma of his *Manual of Plain Song.*

And it was not long before the simple melody of Marbeck's notation was adorned by the harmonies of Thomas Tallis, who, while he left untouched the plain tune of the people's accustomed song, heightened its effect by the addition of accompanying melodies suited to the powers of more instructed vocalists, thus producing, not a new use (for such was as far from his intention as the production of a new Prayer Book was from the intention of the Reformers of his day), but a harmonized arrangement of the accustomed use, in which arrangement the Plain Song of past ages shone forth, a bright line of sound, round which the attendant melodies clustered, as graces to embellish, but not as rivals to obscure.

The musical intelligence of that time seemed to call for some such effort to consecrate the advance of the art and the science of music to the noblest purpose. The works of Palestrina, Orlando di Lasso, Luca Marenzio, and others, were evidences that harmony had then attained to the graces of maturity. These great masters were appreciated and studied in England. Such goodly cedar-trees as Tallis, and Bird, and Gibbons tell us something of the musical qualities of the social soil whence they sprang; and accordingly we find that a practical knowledge of music, an ability to sing the works of the great masters of that period, were among the ordinary accomplishments of educated English people.

Tallis' work was therefore called for by the circumstances of the age in which he lived; and so it was that, at the time when the ceremonial of the Church was popularized, her Music was adapted to the wants of all classes of the community; and while the Book of Common Prayer was provided in a tongue "understanded of the people," our Catholic inheritance, the Plain Song of Christendom, was still recognized as the true expression of the services of that book, and was exhibited in all the varieties of its utterance, whether in the simple recitation and response of the country parish, the pure melody of Marbeck's notation, or the elaborated harmonies of the well-manned and well-trained Cathedral Choir.

For many centuries the Gregorian Tones had been the Canticle and Psalm Chants of the Church. These tones are found inter-

woven with what are technically called the "Services" of the great Church composers of the sixteenth century. To these tones many of the finest anthems of that period owe their grandeur, while their use in the chanting of the Psalter in the mother tongue showed their intrinsic value, and proved them to be the truest expression of the inward devotion of a worshipping congregation.

Such was the state of Church Music in England when Puritanism presented to the people a new theory of public worship. According to this theory, the chief purpose for which Christian congregations assembled was the hearing of sermons, and the listening to extemporaneous prayers, while Music was confined to the singing of Hymns or the Psalms of David tortured into rhyming metre. Prayers and praises, unless thus arranged, were spoken by the minister alone, and not being prescribed forms of prayer and praise, they ceased to be acts of united devotion, and were in reality either addresses to the DEITY or Sermons to the people, which all present might listen to and meditate upon, but which were of course destitute of any essentially musical—I had well nigh said of any devotional—character. Where the people were silent, there could be no real *service*, and where there was not the reality of a Common Worship, there could not be the elements of Church Music.

It will be instructive here to note the causes of the rise and prevalence of this uncatholic, and therefore unscriptural as well as unreasonable theory. Although, at the period of the Reformation, every precaution was taken to perpetuate the ancient and accustomed Music of the Church, although the gift of a Service in the mother tongue was accompanied by the authorized notation of Marbeck, and that notation was adapted, as we have seen, to the requirements of all classes of the community, yet the mass of the people seem to have failed to enter into the true spirit of the Book provided for them. The sixteenth century was indeed an age of musical progress, and yet it was also a period when the rights of the people were lost sight of in the cultivation of elaborations which could be enjoyed only by the comparatively few who, from education and habit, were qualified to appreciate them.

For some time, a body of sturdy, self-willed religionists had been rising up, displaying the prevalent spirit of that age, violently resisting Catholic teaching, stubbornly asserting individual views, and following the example which the Tudor tyrant Henry VIII. had set his subjects when he coerced the Church of

this country into submission to his despotic rule and unbridled lust. These, with a purer aim, but with a like rebellious spirit, made the Reformed Prayer Book the object of their most bitter hostility.

The over-elaboration of Church Music at that period failed to secure for the reformed Book the sympathies of the lower orders, and its uncatholic enemies took advantage of this failure. The people, no longer having their true part or lot in the matter, asserted their own views. Sturdy enthusiasts prayed their own extempore prayers, their followers roared out their jingling rhymes, and Church Music for a time, and but for a short time, took refuge among the comparatively few educated people who could appreciate the privileges of their day without being led astray by its errors. Then was the Church of England taught a lesson which it seems now, alas, as slow to learn as it was then—namely, how grievously Christian worship must suffer if Church Music be allowed to assume a form which unfits it to secure the sympathies and express the devotions of the bulk of assembled congregations.

In this, as in other respects, the zeal, the fervour, the devotion of Puritanism was its own; but the spark of self-willed opposition to authority was fanned into a flame by that unsympathizing and uncatholic spirit which, instead of utilizing the fervour of the Puritans, cold-shouldered them into enemies, and thus perpetuated and even aggravated their errors. For Puritanism was in itself zealous rebellion; but when its spirit leavened the Church, the result was torpid, indolent, selfish neglect.

Conformity to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer of course prevented the complete exhibition of the Puritan theory "in churches and chapels;" yet, wherever the leaven penetrated, its effect was manifested in the altered character of the outward expression of the services of the Church of England. Nor was it difficult, virtually and to all intents and purposes, to Puritanize the use of our Prayer Book. The parish clerk might be relieved of his duties as the leader of congregational worship, and converted into a functionary whose business consisted in monopolizing the people's work, and leaving them (if so inclined) to perform undisturbed their acts of silent meditation upon what was going on about them.

So Confessions and Creeds were left to the jarring utterances of two dissonant voices; Canticles and Psalms, Versicles and Responses assumed the form of conversational dialogue, and Music found no place, save in the singing of the Metrical Psalms or Hymns.

And if, for a time, existing institutions or authorities still preserved in some places the Church's Plain Song, or maintained it in cathedrals and collegiate chapels in its more ornate form, Puritan influences gradually estranged the people from the manner of worship which their Prayer Book required, and paved the way for the acts of spoliation and violence which characterized the era of the Great Rebellion.

Then, while for a time the abomination of a silent desolation stood in many a holy place, a generation witnessed the disbanding of choirs, and the destruction of all that was necessary for the maintenance of "the service of song;" so that, though at the Restoration authorities resumed their offices, Ecclesiastical persons again received their emoluments, and the material machinery of the Church's public ministrations was once more at work, yet the general habit of united worship, the foundation of all Church Music, had been swept away. Divine Service assumed a different form; and that which had made the sanctuary glorious, sank down to the level of a mere artistic performance.

Cathedrals and Collegiate Chapels did no doubt at that time set to work to renew, in some measure, the song of past generations; but the material was lacking which was indispensable to its true restoration. Choirs were reduced in number, the taste for Ecclesiastical music was vitiated, the expression of that music was emasculated, and, above all, the habit of joining together with heart and voice in acts of public devotion was lost to the people, the utterance of the many as the voice of one was no longer heard, the distinct and appropriate recitation of the Priest, the massive expression of the congregational offering was no more; these, the germs of Church Music, which had formerly ripened into the glorious Plain Song, and been enriched with appropriate harmonies, were as though they had not been; and so, though the period of the Restoration was enriched with the works of the immortal Purcell and other great masters, yet the compositions of that era are of a lighter, more secular, less ecclesiastical character; and, had the genius of the composers been tenfold what it was, no amount of anthems, or of "services" (technically so called) could recompense the Church for the loss she sustained when she was robbed of the true voice of her people's devotions.

As time rolled on, the Music of the Cathedral exhibited more and more of the secular and un-ecclesiastical character. Maintained by statute power, Cathedral Service continued to exhibit more or less beauty of a certain kind; but it was no longer the

highest development of an accustomed use, the mass of the people cared little for it; it failed to enlist their sympathies; it claimed no kindred with their accustomed habits of worship; it seemed to have lost sight of its own origin; it knew not "the rock whence it was hewn," nor "the hole of the pit whence it was digged." And how could it be otherwise when its prominent features had been destroyed, and when the foundation on which it was originally built had been swept away; when it was no longer the shrine of the grand Plain Song of Christendom, but a mere musical performance, which owed its chief effects to the place in which it was exhibited and the words with which it was associated; and how could the people, who had for generations lost sight of the truth of public worship, set much value upon what was after all the mere embellishment of what both they and the Cathedrals had long been despoiled.

But, to recur to the time when the people's work in church was darkened by the shade of a meditative silence, if not chilled by the winter of torpid indifference. So great a change as that must have been, by which the voice of congregational devotion was hushed into silence, and the duality of the service of Minister and Clerk substituted for the united offering of Priest and people, could not have been effected in the face of a general and habitual conformity to the spirit as well as to the letter of the Book of Common Prayer.

It is needless to stop to prove what no one can question—that our Prayer Book not only provides for the maintenance of Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the due observance of the Church's Fasts and Festivals, but that it assumes that such maintenance and observance will be the daily rule of the Church. In the case of Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, the expression "not being otherwise reasonably hindered," cannot fairly be viewed in any other light than that of a dispensation in exceptional cases which must be interpreted as well as qualified by the terms of the preceding paragraph, whence the words are taken. This order of the Church enjoins, what all Priests and Deacons have at their Ordination sworn to accept, that such Office shall be said daily, "*either privately* or openly, not being let *by sickness*, or some other urgent cause," equivalent to sickness. That such exceptional cases were expected to be numerous may be conceded; but that the exception should become the general rule, is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of a hearty and sincere conformity.

But Puritanism is essentially commercial and utilitarian in its tendencies, and so its theory not only involved a change in the

manner of public worship, but also an adaptation of the times of public worship to the habits of a community which was then beginning to show signs of that national characteristic which in later times led the First Napoleon to call us a nation of shopkeepers. To confine public worship to the LORD's Day, however contrary to Holy Scripture, and to the general consent of Christians in all ages, was assumed to be a convenient arrangement. That the Festivals and Fasts of the Universal Church (except Christmas, which, as a season of good cheer, retained a strong hold on the Puritan mind) should gradually become obsolete was desirable, because it seemed (though such was far from being really the case) that those observances interfered with the necessary business of daily life.

To say that the Daily Service of the Church was at this time wholly discontinued, or that the Fasts and Festivals of the Christian year were then every where ignored, would be far enough from the truth; but it *is* true that then the leaven began to work, the effects of which, as exhibited in the condition of our Church and her services at the era of the Great Rebellion, showed its insidious nature, and proved the power of its agency; effects now visible in the fact that (especially in secluded districts) a practical assent and consent to the requirements of the Book of Common Prayer, is, by a large proportion of so-called Church people, regarded as an individual peculiarity, or as an unauthorized innovation. Any how, enough was then done to turn a general rule into a minority of exceptional cases, and thus to enfeeble the Church's Song, and to facilitate that change in the outward circumstances of her worship which has been already described.

For it is indispensable to a right view of Church Music, of what it really is and what it really ought to be, that this truth be fully recognized—that a sincere conformity to the spirit of our Prayer Book is necessary to the due celebration of its services. It is not here asserted of each individual sanctuary, that unless the Daily Morning and Evening Prayer be said or sung in that sanctuary there can be no Church Music there; such an assertion would proclaim its own weakness. But what we say is this—that, as long as the neglect of the Daily Service is the general rule of a national Church, as long as the partial and imperfect observance of the Church's Holy Days is the fact in the majority of cases, so long Church Music in its reality, its simplicity, its purity, and its beauty will be a thing difficult to exhibit, hard to maintain, and impossible universally to restore.

For what the congregations of our own day want is, a habit

of distinct, united, outspoken utterance, without which it is vain to look for that unity of expression which is the foundation of all Church Music. This habit can scarcely be acquired so long as the mass of our Church-going population joins in public worship only one day in seven. Clerks and choir-men cannot, as a general rule, efficiently fulfil their duties as the leaders of the people, if that duty be only performed once a week. The firm voice, the distinct enunciation, the ready and fluent delivery, these, and all else that they must possess and exercise, in order to enable the congregation with ease and without that impeded effort which tends to distract devotion, to unite with them in the one-voiced sacrifice, cannot be exhibited in a community where but a small fraction of choir-men and choir-boys know from experience what a daily service is.

Granted that in many churches the daily offering is impracticable—granted that every where daily worship is, from the circumstances of daily life, out of the reach of many—let all be conceded that common sense calls for or experience suggests, still the Daily Matins and Evensong, the due observance of Fast and Festival, should be so far the general rule that the mass of Church-goers should recognize them as their heritage, and not look upon them as intrusive peculiarities. If such were the case, and if in the services of the Church the uplifted voice of the people could be heard, efficiently and intelligently led by the clerks or choir, then the number of persons scattered throughout the land, accustomed to the duties of clerk or chorister, and qualified by daily ministration of those duties to maintain the distinctive character of "the service of song in the House of the LORD" would be so great, and the habit of true congregational utterance would be so general, that those difficulties and hindrances would not exist which are the inevitable consequences of an exclusively Sunday worship. Church Music would be more easily realized, maintained, and perfected, and life and vigour would be given to that spirit of devotion which, like other Christian essentials, requires both an outward sign and an inward grace to ensure its reality.

If, by the path of such conformity to the spirit and letter of our Prayer Book, as English Churchmen, we could retrace our steps, and regain that position from which we have as a nation strayed, during nearly three centuries of Puritan influence—if, by a vindication of the Catholic character of our Prayer Book, we could realize so happy a state of things as the general revival of daily public prayer, the effect of such a return to "the old paths" would be visible in the exhibition of Church Music in

its true character, having its foundation in the "saying" and its development in the "singing" of the Church's public offices.

Were such the case, the probability is, that, in the majority of Churches, the service would be more often said simply than sung elaborately. The advantage would soon be evident. The habit of distinctly uniting in prayers and praises, so that the utterance of many was as the voice of one, would be general. There would not be then, as there is now, an awkward gap, nay, almost "a great gulf," between the torpid dulness of a faint murmur which characterizes the worship of so many churches, and the exaggerated choir performances of others. Such an unseemly contrast would no longer be witnessed. Congregations would recognize "saying" as the foundation of "singing." There would be a unity observable in the services of all churches. When any one accustomed to the simple offering of the rural parish entered a church where circumstances permitted a service of a more evidently musical character, he would recognize his accustomed offering, heightened in its expression, yet the same in its reality; the identical figure, but clad in brighter garments. And even when he worshipped in some House of God where Church Music was heard in all the grandeur of its full development, then he would see the same form, clothed in yet more glorious apparel; clear and distinct, embellished but not obscured, arrayed but not encumbered, would be heard the Plain Song of the Church; that same song which he had heard elsewhere, less elaborately adorned, the very song which his own accustomed simple service had prepared him to rejoice in and to love. Thus, while uniformity would be as undesirable as it would be impossible, unity, that essential unity which marks all the streams that flow from one source, would be attained, and would appear as an outward emblem of the "one communion and fellowship" in which all true worshippers are knit together. Nor is such a picture overdrawn, for if in the majority of cases the services of the Church were more often said than sung, the consequence would be that the generality of Church-goers would be more accustomed to a distinct delivery of the words of our Offices, and clerks and choristers would be better qualified to maintain that distinctness. Music of such a character, or singing of such a kind as obliterated the words, would be unendurable. Such singing and such music would alone be tolerated as enabled the ear more clearly to discern the words, and brought their truth more directly home to the heart: in other words, nothing but real Church Music would be desired. Gladly would those who were accustomed to a service rightly "said" hail the higher expression of the

Church's true song. But insipid and wearisome would that musical service be to them which robbed them of their heritage, and compelled them to stand as mute listeners to that with which, in virtue of their birthright, they claimed to be allowed to join.

Another advantage attending a greater number of services of a simpler nature would be, that Church choirs would not be, what they too often are, unable (at ferial seasons, or when from any other cause it is desirable) to "say" their service distinctly and reverently. It is a notorious fact that in many choirs, where much so-called Church Music is performed, the choristers, if such "saying" were required of them, would be found unacquainted with the elements of their duty.

That the general revival of the Daily Service should thus affect the state of Church Music, is too evident to require further illustration. The influence of the observance of the Church's Holy Seasons is the next point to be established.

Few things are so injurious to Church Music as a constant sameness in the manner of singing or saying the Church's services. If day after day and month after month the picture be of one unvaried hue and tint, unrelieved by light or shade, then, sooner or later, the true outlines will disappear. The consequence of an unbroken uniformity of outward expression will ultimately be, that public worship will degenerate either into an irreverent perfunctory gabble, or into a confused and indistinct murmur.

The observance of the Seasons of the Christian Year, and of the greater and lesser Holy Days, is the appointed preventive of such evils. The Church's year, like the natural year, owes its life and beauty to its varied seasons. The great Holy Days, with their proper Psalms, proper Prefaces, and attendant seasons, vary the entire period from Advent to Trinity with their alternation of light and shadow, and throughout the other half of the year the routine of Daily Matins and Evensong is broken by the fourth Ember season and the occasional Holy Day. Let the manner of service be ever so simple, these days and seasons must, of necessity, if observed in a proper spirit, powerfully and evidently affect the character of that manner. The greater the development of Church Music the more vivid will be the change of character. And thus, from the very fact of its varied expression, the Music of the Church will display a vigour and beauty which it could not exhibit if chained down to the level of a dull uniformity. But let Holy Seasons and Holy Days become obsolete through

neglect, and sameness will engender weariness. Robbed of its brighter jewels, the string of daily pearls will be carelessly worn, then thrown aside, and when that is done, the Church's Song will not even be a witness to the weekly feast of the Resurrection, but be lost in the low murmur of the gloomy observances of a Puritan Sabbath.

This the Puritans well knew, and hence their hostility to all Holy Seasons and to all Holy Days that could fall on a week day. Christmas Day, it is true, they were not inclined to interfere with. Good Friday called for little opposition, for its observance only involved, once in a year, the keeping of two "Sabbaths" in a week. Easter Day and Whitsun Day lost their distinctive character and became as other Sabbaths, and Ascension Day was the object of their bitterest attacks. And when the mass of the people had grown comparatively unconscious of the succession of each Holy Season and of the existence of the Church's Holy Days, then, as a necessary consequence, public worship was, generally speaking, confined to the unvaried sameness of Sabbatic observance, Church Music no longer sat on the throne, and the silence of congregations that transferred their duties to the Parish Clerk reigned in its stead.

Such is the connexion between Church Music and conformity to the letter and spirit of the Prayer Book. Such were the effects which the neglect of the injunctions of that Book produced on the character of its services. And thus did a Puritanic spirit undermine and overthrow the goodly temple of the Church's Song which had stood for ages, and which had, at the period of the Reformation, been prepared for the people's use and adapted to the people's requirements.

During the two centuries which preceded the present Catholic Revival, popular notions concerning Church Music were exactly what might have been expected from such a state of things as has here been described. Congregations *will* sing; and as the service of the Church was generally looked upon as a form of devotions to be listened to rather than an act of common worship, the desire to "lift up the voice" could be gratified only by the use of Metrical Hymn tunes. Choirs, whose lawful occupation was gone, and who recognized no duty beyond that of leading the people in the only song left to them, sometimes ventured to indulge in an anthem. And so it happened that the only acts of public worship in which the people might join vocally, or which the choir might express musically, were such as in one case were not recognized by our Prayer Book (save in the Offices for the Ordering of Priests and the Consecration of Bishops),

and in the other case directed only to be used under special circumstances.

Why the words of prayer and praise, as they stand in the public Offices of the Church, were then (and are now by many) considered as unfit for congregations to sing, and why the very same words when so arranged as to make a rhyme, were supposed to be by some mysterious process transformed into materials suitable for such musical expression, it is hard to conceive. And such a theory can only be consigned to the limbo of vain traditions, in company with the popular notions concerning the state of departed souls, the fallacy that Sunday is the only day for public worship, the supposition that a service is incomplete without a sermon, and such-like delusions.

However, there was an abundance of good material at hand; many of the Psalm tunes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were music of a high order, and for a time they furnished the staple of congregational singing. But, as years rolled on, the vocal propensities of the people, curbed and repressed by arbitrary and unauthorized custom, led them to seek the gratification of strange indulgences. Secular music of all sorts, from time to time, was pressed into the Church's service. The music to Macbeth, commonly attributed to Locke, Giga movements from Corelli, snatches from theatrical and operatic compositions, mutilated portions of oratorio music, these, and a mass of other incongruous and unsuitable materials gradually took the place of the genuine Psalm tune. Improper selection led to unworthy performance; and in the majority of cases the music heard in churches, though endured by many because of the purpose *for* which it was used, and the place *in* which it was used, became a positive infliction on the musical ear, and an object of ridicule to the careless and the profane.

Now and then, in rural districts, but oftener in town and city churches and chapels, attempts were made to introduce portions of so-called Cathedral Music. But what was borrowed from the cathedral was generally of such a vitiated and unecclesiastical character, that Church Music suffered as much from such introduction as from being confined to the Psalm or Hymn tune. Then, while efforts to introduce more music into public worship were made under the impression that an imitation of the Cathedral was a move in the right direction, the taste for unsuitable and unecclesiastical music gradually increased, for at the end of the last century and the beginning of this, many of the Cathedral composers had adopted an effeminate and inferior style, the effect of which was observable in the popularity which such composi-

tions enjoyed, and may be even now seen in the use of Jackson's "Te Deum" and such secularities. To imitate the Cathedral Music of the day was to follow a deteriorating example, and to take as a model that which had lost its essential features, and consequently Church Music, in the true sense of the term, suffered in proportion as such imitation prevailed.

When, therefore, about a quarter of a century ago, the attempt was made to restore Church Music to its true position, and to exhibit its true expression, difficulties existed which it is not easy to exaggerate. Earnest and true-hearted men strove to revive the Church's Song. Many devout and well-meaning men resisted any interference with their habits of public devotion. The apathetic and careless were, of course, as hostile to the outward sign of life as they were to inward vitality. In one place might be heard the undisturbed dialogue; in another, the degenerated Psalm tune and the indistinct murmur of the people's part of the Service; in another a corrupt following of a corrupted Cathedral use. While with more or less knowledge of the origin, history, and character of Church Music, efforts were elsewhere made to restore the breaches of former generations, and made under the disadvantage of a general ignorance on the part of the bulk of Church-goers of the real duty of the people in Church; so that what would have been heard to advantage if sustained by the firm, matured, and educated adult voice, was not appreciated, because of necessity, in many cases, left to the imperfect utterance of imperfectly educated children. Hence "the chaos of conflicting sounds" already spoken of; hence the difficulties which beset the path of the Church musician; and hence the cry, so often raised, for "Protestant simplicity."

But what did this cry mean? Perhaps some well-intentioned people who raised it, had they been sufficiently acquainted with the subject of their clamour, would have desired the right thing, and endeavoured to revive the Plain Song of the Church, the "one use" which our Reformers had prepared and prescribed for "the whole realm," for that was really "Protestant simplicity." But, probably, the cry expressed in most cases a desire to maintain the traditions of our post-Reformation generations. Yet, if those traditions were "Protestant simplicity," which of those many innovations was supposed to have the best claim to the title? Did "Protestant simplicity" mean silence in the congregation, or was it to be found in music that was painful to the ear and offensive to good taste? Did it mean the roar of an organ, accompanied by the shrill scream of school children? Did it mean the harsh grind of an harmonium, or the limited faculties

of a barrel-organ similarly accompanied? Or did this cry betoken a yearning after the orchestra of fiddle and clarionet, the serpent and french horn, the bassoon and trombone, which in rural districts had not unfrequently taken the place of the church choir, and which (as a right reverend Prelate said in his sermon at a choral festival lately held in a certain cathedral) "made the bare walls ache with the screech of their discord?" Which of all these traditions was the realization of "Protestant simplicity;" and if any of these did realize the idea, what must "Protestant elaboration" be? Or did this cry come from the breeches pocket, was it uttered by a covetous spirit that wished to offer unto GOD that which cost nothing, or by a spirit of indifference that was best satisfied with whatever gave the least trouble?

As might naturally be expected from what has been already said, the service in the generality of churches, and the modern Cathedral use, have long been thought of and spoken of as two essentially different things. And no wonder; for the "one use," or the simpler recitation which is the foundation of all true Church "use," had been in the one case laid aside, and the Puritan practice of listening to the service had been substituted for it; in the other case the "use" had been lost sight of, and hidden under its embellishments. Both had wandered from the true path, each in its own direction, so that the one was no longer the germ of the other. Hence arose the fallacy of recognizing (contrary to the directions of the Prayer Book) two "uses," viz. a read service and a musical service.

However, in the face of all these difficulties, the attempt to restore Church Music has been, and continues to be made with all that determination of purpose which belongs to the English character, and animated by that spirit which never tires in doing GOD'S work. And perhaps the most satisfactory result of these labours may now be seen in those churches in London and in other populous districts, where Divine Service is celebrated in a way as distinct from that which has generally been called the Cathedral Service as it is from what has been commonly called the Parish Church Service. In these churches, the number of which is yearly increasing, may be heard the nearest approach to true Church Music which the present generation has yet witnessed. They bid fair to occupy the position which was evacuated when they who should have been an united force formed themselves into two divisions and marched in different directions.

The practical results of the last twenty-five years' work clearly prove that no satisfactory progress will be generally made till it

be conceded that the Service of the Church is not to be preached, nor to be read (in the ordinary sense of that word), but to be "said or sung." Till this truth be acknowledged, congregational worship will never be realized; for choirs and congregations will never make their responses clearly and firmly, or recite Creed, Confession, and LORD'S Prayer with care and distinctness, unless they have a definite tone to respond to or to unite with.

The prevalent use of the word "intone" is to be deprecated. It is the cause of much misconception, and the evidence of much practical error. The Service of the Church is not ordered to be "intoned," but to be "said or sung." To "say" is not to whine unintelligibly, nor to disfigure the close of each sentence by a prolonged drawl, nor to adopt such a forced and unnatural tone as absorbs the words, and prevents their being distinctly heard. But it is to deliver the words with all the distinctness, reverence, and accuracy of expression which the voice can display under any circumstances, and at the same time to recite them at a clear and definite pitch of the voice. And the reason for such "saying" is two-fold. Firstly, The words thus "said" are a public offering to Almighty GOD, an offering made in His House, and therefore the manner of their delivery should be suited to the purpose to which they are consecrated, and distinct from the manner adopted when the voice is used for other and inferior purposes. Such "saying" excludes individual peculiarities, and directs the attention of all present to the act of worship rather than to the officiating person. Secondly, In the public Services of the Church, congregations have to make their appointed response, or to recite together with the Priest, and they can neither do the one nor the other with ease, unity, and distinctness unless there be a clear and definite pitch of voice to guide them. This two-fold reason may be thus stated concisely. Divine Service is directed to be "said or sung,"—

Firstly, That all may be done to the greater glory of GOD:

Secondly, That all may be done to secure the truer offering of the people.

The "saying" of the service is often condemned as deficient in *expression*. Probably this idea of deficiency is sometimes caused by the *abuse* rather than the *use* of "saying." If "the Priests, the Ministers of GOD," are penetrated with a deep sense of the reality of their office, "saying," as above described, will never be wanting in expression. The "abundance of the heart" will give a truer character to the uncoloured delivery, than all the daubings with which teachers of elocution would persuade their misled pupils to disfigure the Church's offices and degrade their

priestly duty. Words of prayer will unconsciously fall more slowly and reverently from the lips than words of praise; yet, in the one case, an artificial and wearisome drawl will not take the place of the eagerness of earnest supplication, and in the other case, any increased rapidity of utterance will be imperceptible, it will be recognized only as the jubilant offering of a spirit quickened by the truth—"Whoso offereth Me thanks and praise, he honoureth Me."

To "sing" the service is to adopt such inflexions of the voice, or to use such melody as the manner of celebrating the service requires. Important as it is to attain to the one-voiced utterance of the many, desirable, as it must be, to realize that massive unity by which the Church Militant may, however feebly and imperfectly, imitate "the sound of many waters" of the Church Triumphant, yet Church Music must not be lowered to suit existing popular tastes, but the offering of the people must be raised to the standard of the true expression of the Church's Song. Acting on this principle, an end may soon be put to the mischievous and uncatholic notion that choirs are to turn the Canticles into Anthems, to which the congregation are to be mute listeners. Such a practice was worthy of the eighteenth century, but may be scarcely tolerated now, at a time when the principles of common prayer and the truths of Catholic worship are more generally known and better understood.

The view that has been now taken of Church Music, of its real nature, of the vicissitudes it has experienced in this country during the last three centuries, and of its present condition, will pave the way for a few practical remarks.

It has been too often forgotten that Church Music should have a phrase, character, and expression peculiarly its own, and essentially differing from secular music. It would be easy to bring abundant proofs, not only that the "vineyard" has been defiled with divers seeds, but that many of the plants have little or no distinctive character. If we could forget where we were, and become unconscious of the words used (not an impossibility), we might fancy ourselves at the popular concerts, and wake from our dream to find ourselves in the church of S. ——, listening to Somebody's "Service" "in A, B, C, or D, &c."; or we might pause in some evening street-perambulation, and look up in doubt as to whether the sounds that disturbed our reverie were those of an Evensong at S. ——, or whether they came from the "Glee and Part-song Society" which meets at the house of our good friend at the opposite corner. True, indeed, that such has, in a mea-

sure, been the case in all ages. Doubtless, three centuries ago, many a musical phrase was common to the anthem and to the madrigal. Yet a fault is not the less a fault because it has been always, more or less, a besetting sin; and surely the assimilation of "ecclesiastical" and "secular" which may be detected in some of the music of the sixteenth century produced no good effects in the subsequent centuries.

But how is this distinctive difference to be maintained? Of what style or school of music can it be said that it is strictly and essentially Church Music? Probably there are many who would point to the music which we find in the older Office books, music written in the ancient Church modes, scales, or gamuts; and who would tell us that the disuse of those modes has tended to secularize Church Music, and that modern musicians have lost much by rejecting these modes, and confining themselves to the major and minor diatonic scales. And it would not be easy to gainsay such persons; for no doubt the extent of musical expression has been much contracted, and the variety of musical phrase much limited by the substitution of modern for ancient modes. We could have little sympathy with any who could not appreciate the vigour, the purity, the sublimity, the essentially devotional character of these ancient Church Melodies. Experience shows that music of this school, when intelligently and properly used, wears well, and retains an unfading freshness; while much of the music in modern phrase, though of a character more adapted to the taste of the million, soon becomes insipid, threadbare, and wearisome.

The controversy between Gregorian and Anglican music has of late been marked by an acrimony unsuited to the subject. It is not difficult to account for a portion of the hostility evinced by some persons towards the Gregorian music, as it is called. Much of this dislike arises from the fact that the undue preponderance of boy-voice in many choirs, and the want of sufficient educated adult material prevent due justice being done to it, hide its beauties, and exhibit faults that belong rather to the singer than to the song. Again, to the ears of many who have been accustomed to the softer and more sensuous music of later times, the ancient Church Music often seems harsh and austere, as wholesome food has at first little attraction to the palate of one who has been long fed on sweetmeats. But above all, the use of this music involves a greater amount of unison singing; and this makes it specially unpopular with the many choir singers whose ideas of singing are limited to the delivery of their own part in the harmony.

Long and constant practical experience in choral service work

and choir management, careful study and examination of ancient Ecclesiastical music, judicious use of the advantages resulting from that undoubted advance of the art and science of music which marks the present generation, and, above all, a due recognition of the real duties of a chorister and the great object of a choir—these are the waymarks of a path which will lead at once to a change in the character of the controversy, and ultimately to a settlement of the dispute.

That music which has for ages been consecrated to the Church's service; that music to which many a great master has owed more than he was conscious of owing; those phrases, modes, and sequences in which the giant genius of Sebastian Bach revelled, is well worth the study of those who would be Church musicians. More intimate acquaintance with it, and more practical knowledge of it, will give a higher and truer character to that musical progress which unquestionably distinguishes this latter part of the nineteenth century.

The lovers of the ancient music of the Church will do unwisely if they adhere too slavishly to the letter of the music they love, while they cultivate its spirit. The art and science of our own age should be consecrated to a further development of the beauties of true Church Music, and to a fuller exhibition of its real character. Its ultimate and general revival will depend upon the judgment and taste displayed in its reproduction. It must be revived not only on paper, but by such choir management as will realize its spirit and do it justice.

In the formation of a choir the old adage must be remembered, "The longest way round is the shortest way thither." There are from time to time, in London and the larger provincial towns, cases where, under special circumstances, the choir has to be formed and the manner of service decided upon before the congregation can be said to exist. When such is the case, the line of action is generally clear enough. But oftener it happens that it is deemed desirable to form a choir and make some definite effort for the restoration of Church Music for the benefit of a congregation unaccustomed either to "say or sing" the Offices of their Prayer Book. In such cases the course too generally adopted is to muster as many voices as can be collected, chiefly boy-voices; and with a choir thus assembled, often with more reference to vocal than to more important qualifications, an evident, perhaps a considerable, change is effected in the accustomed manner of celebrating Divine Service; effected, perhaps, in a few weeks or months. To all appearance the task is done; but time

shows that in reality it is but begun. Experience testifies how difficult choristers are to deal with, how hard it is to maintain their number, to supply the places of those who retire from caprice or from necessity, and to maintain satisfactorily the course adopted. Meanwhile the congregation is generally more or less divided in opinion, opposing or co-operating with the wishes of the incumbent as the case may be. He finds that he has embarked on a stormy sea; he is unwilling, of course, to put back into port, yet has little prospect of smooth-water sailing; and often, after years of labour, little seems to be really done in the way of effecting that change in habits of worship which the true Church musician desires to effect.

In such cases a course is here recommended chiefly adapted to country parishes, or to small town congregations, but which might even be suggestive in other cases. There is the clerk, an existing, though in most cases a very imperfect and even degraded institution: utilize it if possible. It is a serious error to ignore an office which is the germ of all that is really wanted. If the clerk has, or can acquire, a good and educated delivery, if he be susceptible of the necessary training for his work, well and good: there is some material at hand. Associate with him two or three adults, devout men, communicants, with some ear for music, willing and able to enter into the true spirit of common worship, and prepared to acquire, if they have it not already, a thorough knowledge of the service they take part in. When it is possible, let them be men of education and position, ready to consecrate their example, as well as their abilities, to the glory of God and the promotion of true congregational worship. Is it possible that there are many parishes where this cannot be done? If this be the case, such a fact tells badly for the influence of the Church.

The assistance of boys might, in time, be desirable, if they were evidently fitted by natural gifts, personal character, and the circumstances of their life for the choristers' office, but devout, intelligent, and well-qualified men form the best foundation, and will be found to be the true staple of Church choirs. Then let the Services of the Church be said simply and distinctly; a clear enunciation and an united delivery thus maintained by a few effective voices will be a safe and proper guide and help to the congregation in the discharge of their duty as worshippers in the sanctuary. When all is thus done, however simply, yet "decently and in order;" when the clear one-voiced utterance characterizes the responses and also such parts of the service as Priest and people unite in reciting; when a due knowledge of the nature and intent of each part of the Office is evinced

by the manner in which it is rendered; when Canticles and Psalms are said fluently, and the true foundation of chanting is thus laid; the congregation will not be long (especially if their duties be judiciously pointed out to them) before they acquire that habit of united outspoken worship which is essential to the success of all further efforts. While such a course is in progress, the singing of hymns, in unison if needs be (for strong clear unison is better than weak and badly balanced harmony) will relieve the monotony of extreme simplicity.

Then there will soon be a craving for chanting on the part of the congregation; the Canticles should of course occupy the place of honour, and be the first to receive choral embellishment; and other parts of the service would follow at the discretion of the incumbent, who, as a good "Ritualist," would direct and control all these efforts in such a way that the true end might be obtained, and false notions and practices nipped in the bud.

It would be well if generally the congregational demand for further musical elaboration preceded the supply as afforded by the choir; for choirs should so guide and lead that congregations may join, and not go ahead, so that the people may do nothing but listen. To substitute such listening for that common worship which our Prayer Book provides for, would be to fall into an error kindred to that which has exalted preaching above the offering of the prayers and praises of Christian congregations.

But while the desire evinced by the congregation should in some measure affect the provision made for them, the nature of the supply should be wholly at the discretion of properly qualified authorities. For it is one thing to give the people what they need; it is another thing to gratify them with the exact thing they call for. By degrees boys' voices might be added, care being taken to select such as possessed the necessary qualifications of ear, voice, and education, and, above all, such as were devoutly looking forward to Confirmation, and likely, from the influences of home training or other associations, to become in due time regular communicants. Harmonized singing, *when desirable*, would then be attainable, and the path would be cleared for all such musical elaboration as the circumstances of the case called for. Slow and sure would then be the progress, and the Church's Plain Song in its true form would soon become a deeply rooted tradition, instead of assuming the character of a disputed novelty. *Then* Church Music would be a plant of vigorous life, striking its roots deep into the soil, and stretching its branches far and wide. *Then* we should not have the great act of Christian worship, the Eucharistic Office,

dishonoured by absent choirs and cold mutterings, while the other Services were jubilant with chant and song.

We are in these days deluged with chants for Psalms and Canticles. In the construction of these, the comparative neglect of the ancient Church modes has limited the available stock of musical phrases, while popular and accustomed phrases have been presented in every possible shape till they are positively worn threadbare. Sometimes two or more chants bearing the names of different composers, exhibit no real or essential difference, either in their harmony or in their melody. It seems desirable then, to point out certain qualifications as essential to the Canticle and Psalm chant. A rejection of such as do not possess these qualifications would rid our shelves and our choirs of much of which we might truly say that their room is better than their company.

Firstly, The tune or melody of the chant should not extend beyond those notes which experience tells us are common to most congregations. Secondly, The chant should be Ecclesiastical in its character, and such as may be effectively sung in unison. Thirdly, It should be written in a musical phrase, "understanded of the people;" the melody such as they can easily learn, and in which they can readily join; the harmony (for it may be desirable to sing the Gloria Patri, and sometimes verses of special import in harmony and "full") easy, flowing, and melodious in its different progressions. Double chants are to be rejected, because unsuited to the construction of the Psalms and Canticles. When it can be shown—though it never can be shown, for the theory is contrary to the spirit and mind of Hebrew poetry—and not before, that each idea expressed in Canticles and Psalms always occupies two verses, that each truth set forth is exhibited in couplets, then it will be time to take to double chants: and even then we should shrink from adopting compositions which made their first appearance at a period when Church music was at its lowest ebb.

In further "dividing" (for the purpose of facilitating chanting) the verses already by authority "pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches," it should be remembered that chanting is something more than recitation. The whole verse is not recitative. The close of each half of the verse is a musical passage in the ordinary sense of the expression; consequently the assignment of too many syllables to the notes of the mediation or the termination, and thus turning the whole chant into a recitative, is a practice ruinous to chanting. The assignment of

words to the notes of the mediation and termination should be made in conformity with the method adopted by the best masters in their combination of words and music. As a general rule it is desirable to assign an emphatic syllable to an accented note; but in the works of the highest repute we find here and there instances of unemphatic words assigned to accented notes, and it would be better, in dividing for chanting, sometimes to choose the lesser evil of an infraction of the general rule, rather than to destroy the character of the chant by a rigid adherence to the rule in every case.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that the mediation partakes somewhat of the nature both of recitative and song, while the termination has nothing of the recitative about it[1]. The former slightly, the latter entirely, interrupts the recitation. The mediation may therefore close with two or more syllables; the recitation should never thus close.

Generally speaking, in chanting the Psalms, unison chanting is to be preferred. Where the choir is not complete, where either the "cantoris" or "decani" side—*i.e.*, in ordinary language, the north and south side of the choir respectively, the side which leads and the side which is led—has not the full complement of voices, and so is unable to balance well the parts of the harmony, chanting in harmony is undesirable. Even in the fullest and best choirs, where the balance on both sides is perfect, that balance will be more or less disturbed by congregational singing. And, after all, there can be no doubt that the best trained choir and the most accomplished singers will find that the perfection of unison chanting will employ all their powers. To chant the Psalms as with one voice, to ring out the words clearly, to give due expression to the ever-varying character of the verses, is a task which will give scope to the exercise of greater abilities than most choirs possess, and will, to say the least, fully employ the talents of the most artistic.

Harmonized chanting, however, may be effectively used for the Gloria Patri and other verses of special import. Then, the change from unison gives a refreshing richness to that very harmony which is often wearisome from its constant repetition.

Unison chanting leaves the organist at liberty, at times, and with discretion to adapt his harmonies to the character of the verses. Organists, as well as choristers, will do well to believe that the endeavour to realize the perfection of unison chanting will afford ample employment for their talents. It is often

[1] See *On dividing the Psalms for Chanting.* By Rev. S. S. Greatheed.

desirable that the organist should leave the melody to be maintained in all its power and beauty by a choir well skilled in unison chanting; and by a judicious management of his instrument, display in perfection the charm of a well accompanied recitative and song.

The remark is often made, that the organ accompaniment to Psalm-chanting is less satisfactory in some Churches than in others. May not this be explained by the suggestion that organists do not always remember that they have to accompany the chant, and not to overwhelm the choir by making the melody too prominent? Hence the importance of placing the organ sufficiently near to the choir.

What has just been said suggests a few remarks on the propriety of an organ accompaniment to the Creed, and to the LORD'S Prayer. It certainly seems that such accompaniment is often desirable, and when well managed, is most effective; still its chief recommendation is, that it covers defects and ensures unity. If choristers were, in general, more careful to acquire a habit of full, perfect, one-voiced utterance, and if congregations were more careful, and more capable of joining with one voice and one soul with the choir, the organ accompaniment would be, comparatively speaking, superfluous, though even in such case the full-voiced enunciation of the verities of the Faith, as heard in some large Churches, is inexpressibly grand, affecting, and devotional. Another view of the question, however, appears to be this, that the Belief, as the expression of the one faith held by all Christian people, should be uttered by all, as with one voice, and distinguished from other parts of the service by being unmixed with any other sound. And it is not the province of this Essay to decide between them: though it is only fair to say that the rubric following the Jubilate in Matins expressly gives a licence to both minister and people to *sing* the Apostles' Creed; a process which at least would be difficult without an organ accompaniment. A similar line of argument would apply to the LORD'S Prayer, which it is urged, being "the Prayer" of prayers, should be distinguished from all others, and the voices of the faithful alone should be employed in its recitation.

The responsive character of the Divine Service of the Church cannot be maintained in life and vigour, if pauses and gaps are allowed to turn into a cold, disjointed, apathetic series, that which ought to be a chain of living, fervent acts of devotion. Versicle, suffrage, invocation, deprecation, supplication, collect, and commandment have, each and all, their proper answer from

the people's lips, whether that answer be a Response, a Kyrie, or an Amen. Here and there, from the nature and construction of the office, pauses are required; but generally speaking, the utterance of the Priest should be caught up, ere it dies away, by the choir, while the sound of their response should not cease before the first word of his next sentence is heard. Similarly with regard to antiphonal chanting. Each verse should come forth from its preceding verse, and lead on to the next by an unbroken line of sound; thus the chant should roll on, deliberate, yet life-like, emphatic words brought out in strong relief, yet no unemphatic words dropped, slurred over, swallowed, gabbled, or smudged; the choir exhibiting such lights and shades in chanting as are suggested not only by the varied character of the Psalms, but also by the different seasons of the Church's year, and the organist framing his accompaniment accordingly. At times the "full" verse requires a short pause after it, and thus by contrast adds to the beauty of the whole.

It is very important that, in choral service, due prominence should be given to the Canticles. If the Psalms be said, let the Canticles be sung; if the Psalms be chanted in unison, let the Canticles be sung in harmony; and to music which, while equally intelligible to the congregation, is of a more effective character. The words of the Canticles are familiar to all, therefore music of a more ornate kind may more safely be appropriated to them. At the same time, the Canticles, as well as the Responses of our Offices are the people's heritage, and congregations must not be robbed of their birthright by Te Deum, Benedictus, and Magnificat being sung to music which compels the assembled worshippers to become mere listeners. How far the "Chant Services" which have lately appeared, may prove desideranda, is a question which experience alone can answer.

It would be well if, while Hymnals are multiplying *ad infinitum*, sufficient attention were paid to Hymn singing. Hymnology seems to outstrip Hymnody. No doubt many of the sixteenth-century hymn tunes are of a high character. Even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries an occasional addition to the stock of true Church Hymns and Hymn tunes was now and then made; and, of late, the store has, unquestionably, been much enriched. But the mine of gold is the yet inexhausted treasure of the Hymns and Hymn tunes of earlier ages; and the deeper we dig in this mine, the purer will be the doctrines of our Hymns and the better will be the singing of our Hymn tunes.

A Hymn tune, to be really effective, and suitable for Divine

Service, should possess two characteristics:—Firstly, it should be well adapted to the words to which it is sung; and, Secondly, there should be a distinctive character in its melody. Many of the modern collections of Hymn tunes contain tunes which are either so destitute of any specific character, or so closely resembling each other that congregations fail to recognize them, or to distinguish them, and consequently care little to sing them. Insipid melodies,wearisome reproduction of stock phrases, and maudlin harmonies, incumber many of the Hymn-tune books of the present day.

Important as it is to avoid the error of pandering to popular and vitiated tastes, care should nevertheless be taken to make the Hymn tune attractive. Hymn singing, as well as Psalm chanting, calls for a careful attention on the part of the choir to the distinct enunciation of the words. They should be "cut out" cleanly. Even in choirs where harmony can be well maintained, frequent unison Hymn singing is desirable, and heightens the effect of occasional harmony. The heavy conventicle drawl is happily becoming daily more and more obsolete. Yet choirs are but human, and so are liable to go from one extreme to another, and it may be fairly suggested that now, sometimes, the pace is unduly quickened. When circumstances permit, and the number and variety of voices render it practicable, life and power may be given to Hymn-singing by assigning occasional verses to boys alone, or men alone. Sometimes such antiphonal treatment would be most effective, yet, like all strong colouring, its good effect in the picture depends upon the discretion with which it is used. Well-trained and effective choirs should not think the Hymn tune unworthy of their careful cultivation. A Hymn tune sung in a slovenly manner is a sad set-off against a well-executed anthem.

The Anthem is intended to exhibit the consecration of music of the highest order to the noblest purpose. Words of Christian faith, hope, and love, are by the anthem so expressed, that they come home with great power to the hearts of the hearers, while the music abides in the memory, and helps to strengthen the hold which the words take of the affections. Congregations are therefore listeners to anthems; and, in order that they should listen to edification, and meditate to their comfort, the performance should be such as may assist their meditations by its power, and not distract them by its weakness. So then, it is not desirable that imperfectly qualified choirs should sing anthems at all. The anthem fails of its purpose when the listeners are more anxious as to whether the choir can manage it, or when the choir

will finish it, than absorbed in the devout meditations which it is intended to encourage. In a word, it should be positively and not comparatively well sung; not only tolerable, but attractive. Choirs often waste much time in getting up anthems to which they are unable eventually to do justice, time which would be far better spent in such exercises and studies as are calculated to enable them rightly to understand and properly to perform their more essential duties. In other cases it is sadly true that we may hear in the anthem all that could be desired, and in the other parts of the service much that is to be deprecated.

Still, though not essential, the anthem, if rightly viewed, judiciously chosen, and well sung, is a very important part of a choral service. Its due cultivation encourages a patient and diligent attention to the science of music, induces choristers to become good sight-singers, improves the tastes both of choir and congregation, and, above all, tells the world that the Church is prepared to consecrate the best music as an offering to God in His own House.

Great care should be taken by choirs to distinguish the singing of prayers from the singing of praises, by giving to each its appropriate expression. Where this is neglected, Kyrie, Response, Miserere, Canticle, Gloria Patri, and Gloria Tibi, are sung with the same tone, character, and expression of voice. Church Music will never thrive under such treatment.

The work of Church Music restoration, to be effective, must be gradual and synthetic. Old abuses will be perpetually reappearing in new forms, the error essentially the same, its development circumstantially different. A service distinctly, reverently, and intelligently "said" has more of real Church Music in it than a service elaborately "sung," and yet disfigured by incongruities, unrealities, and offences against the rules of worship and the principles of devotion. The true Church builder has, in his efforts at restoration, a hard task to perform. But he works on materials that will yield to his art, and the result of his labour stands out before men's eyes and proclaims its own excellence. The true Church musician also has, in his attempts to effect a revival, a task yet more difficult. His work appeals, not to the eye, but to the ear and to the heart. He has the rough granite blocks of uncatholic custom to chisel into shape, and the "untempered mortar" of modern tradition to remove.

J. W. Rumsey.

The Curate Question.

I.—INTRODUCTION.

An Essay on a Question of the Day, to be of any permanent useful effect, must aim at so stating the subject as (1) to draw popular attention to its minor and less considered, but perhaps most important details; (2) to define the true principles; and (3) thus to point out the right direction for future practical measures on the subject. Such, however, is the main purpose of the writer in his present undertaking. The Curate Question, indeed, presents a variety of aspects, which, for the most part wisely enough, are viewed separately and treated as distinct questions by those who take in hand their practical solution; but which it may be of advantage to bring together and consider as a whole and single thesis in their several relative bearings on the common subject; viz.:—the right and proper position of that large and increasing class of Clergy in the sacred Ministry of the Church of England which is popularly designated by the title 'Curate.'

II.—DEFINITION OF THE TITLE 'CURATE.'

In its truest and less limited signification this is surely among the most honourable of all clerical appellations. It has more of a spiritual and less of a secular meaning than 'Rector,' and 'Vicar,' or than the good old Anglo-Ecclesiastical title 'Parson,' as used among ourselves. It savours less of ownership of tithes, and association with other temporalities and mere Ecclesiastical law. Lay-impropriation, indeed, effectually excludes from the conventional title 'Rector,' as such, the idea of "obedience to them which have the rule over you" in any spiritual sense. The title 'Vicar' simply witnesses to the fact of lay-impropriation. And the term 'Parson' properly implies no more than the legal representation in corporation-sole of the rights and privileges of the temporal benefice. On the Continent of Europe the offices of 'Vicar' and 'Curate' do indeed retain more of a purely Ecclesiastical and spiritual character, and obtain for the use of the latter title a more Catholic authority. It is still so used in several of

our Colonies[1]. Its use, too, more than once in our own Prayer Book, especially in the Office of Holy Communion, where, as elsewhere, it shares with the title 'Bishops' the designation of the entire sacred Ministry, invests it with even the dignity of a liturgical recognition. Such no doubt was its original and proper use among ourselves[2]. Its literal meaning implies a being put in trust with the pastoral charge of souls. It implies, perhaps more than any other title, actual service in the sacred Ministry. It implies, on the part of those who hold it, direct spiritual relationship with "all congregations committed to their charge." It has a wider signification than even the title 'Parish-Priest,' because it includes Deacons also, and even Bishops who may possess a parochial cure; and again all who, without any such special jurisdiction, are yet engaged in the ministry of souls. It is more nearly equivalent to and co-extensive with our common phrase 'the working Clergy,' as implying actual service, and that in all Orders of the Ministry. And, so considered, it is, as was said above, perhaps the most honourable of our clerical titles. A worthy fulfilment of the office is just that which the holy Apostle seems to indicate when he says:—"They that have used the office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree—*βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιοῦνται*" (1 Tim. iii. 13); and again, "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour (*διπλῆς τιμῆς*), especially they who labour in the Word and doctrine" (*Ibid.* v. 17).

III.—POPULAR ESTIMATE OF THE OFFICE.

Such, then, are the theoretical dignity and deserts of the Curate's office. Practically considered, as it exists among ourselves, it is only a literal truth to say, that its comparative valuation is exactly in an inverse ratio, and that they who actually serve it, so far from being 'counted worthy of double honour'

[1] "The way in which I am mentioned as the Dean's Curate seems to imply that my opinion was necessarily the same as the Dean's. But the fact is, that Curates in the vulgar English sense of the word, are unknown in this Colony (Natal), as also are Rectors and Vicars. We are all Curates, and my own position is the same as that of any other Priest in the diocese."—Extract from letter in the *Guardian*, Dec. 27th, 1866, signed F. S. Robinson.

[2] Bishop Latimer, in a sermon, says:—"that through fee-farming of benefices, he (the Parson) may go where he will for any house he shall have to dwell in, or any glebe land to keep hospitality withal, but he must take up a chamber in an ale-house, and there sit to play at tables all day—a *goodly Curate!*"—Quoted from *Posthumous Gleanings*, by the late Rev. E. Budge, in an Essay entitled, "England's Glory, England's Mission."

are, as long as they continue in it, rather 'the least esteemed in the Church.' It seems, indeed, almost like a curious piece of fine irony, that 'Perpetual Curate' should be the title fixed upon by law to designate the holders of the lowest class of freehold benefices. But there is a lower grade still, to whom no such perpetuity in their sphere of ministerial duty and its emoluments is legally secured, whose pastoral work and official maintenance, humanly speaking, and of course under GOD'S good Providence, are a matter of mere accident and constantly shifting; and these, too, by a remarkable seeming contradiction, are pre-eminently invested with the dignity of the Church's most honourable title, while holding the lowest clerical rank as 'Curates' proper, or with the explanatory adjuncts, 'Assistant,' 'Stipendiary,' or 'Licensed' Curates. It is more particularly with the unsatisfactory condition of this, it must be emphatically repeated, large and increasing class of English Clergy, that the writer of the present Essay has undertaken thus to deal—unsatisfactory, it is meant, not only to the feelings of those whose Providential lot it is to continue in the sacred Office, but, what is an infinitely more important consideration, as regards the real pastoral work and ministerial efficiency of the Church of England.

IV.—PROOF FROM AN ARTICLE ON 'CURATES' IN THE 'SATURDAY REVIEW.'

As some proof of the worldly estimation in which the office is at present held in England, it may not be unfair to refer to a recent Article in a popular Review (*Saturday Review*, Oct. 27th, 1866), entitled "The Genesis of Curates." The Article, indeed, is full of gratuitous insults to the Clergy generally, and is based on most groundless imputations. Still, it may fairly be taken as an indication of the popular *feeling* on the subject. It is probably a true reflection of that feeling when it says, "the Rector, or Vicar, and the Curate are distinct classes, and must not be confounded. We instinctively feel the difference. Against the Curate, the mere Curate, we must confess there is somewhat of a presumption. We expect him to be a bore till he proves himself to be otherwise; no doubt he often does prove himself to be otherwise; still in the case of the Curate there is a presumption one way, while in the case of the Rector there is no presumption either way. It is a mistake to suppose that the Rector is necessarily a mere full-blown Curate, or that he necessarily has been a Curate at all. He may or he may not have been. A large proportion of the best and most intellectual of

the beneficed Clergy never were Curates in any strict sense. In many cases they never held a Curacy at all; in other cases they have held Curacies under circumstances which altogether distinguish them from the genuine Curate." The article goes on to explain that this remark applies principally to "Clerical Fellows of Colleges," and also to "the holders of what are called 'Family Livings.'" "Such men," it is added, "often take a Curacy to keep themselves in Ecclesiastical practice till they get a College living, but they are essentially different from the genuine Curate. And we could point to some of the most distinguished men in the Church who never, even in this way, held a Curacy at all. The genuine Curate, the Curate pure and simple, the man who is nothing in the world but a Curate, is something altogether different." The article proceeds to say, in the most offensive language the writer can command, that the "mere Curate" must be almost always "either a literate or an undistinguished University man." "The Curates come mainly from the class who do not get Classes and Fellowships." "As a rule, the ranks of our Curate-hood are supplied by youths whom, at the best, merciful Examiners have raised from the very gates of pluck to the comparative paradise of the gulf." And so the Article all along proceeds on the assumption, that *intellect* or *family* is the prime qualification for preferment in the Church of England; that admission to the rank of 'Curate-hood' is essentially a degradation; that, as a matter of fact, "the most distinguished men in the Church have never held a Curacy at all;" and that, in short, of all classes of the Anglican Clergy, the Curates are the 'least esteemed in the Church.' Now insolence, well or ill-deserved, implies real or supposed contemptibleness in the object of it. Making every allowance, then, for the gratuitous impertinence of a smart and flippant pasquinade like this, the lampoonery of which consists in exaggerated caricature, we may still regard it as affording some sufficient evidence and indication of the popular estimate of the Curate's comparative social position.

V.—REASONS FOR POPULAR DEPRECIATION OF THE OFFICE.

Nor is it difficult to analyze the elementary motives of this disparagement. It results, no doubt, from a perception of the subordinate and dependent relation of the Curate. His real personal influence and importance are proportionate to his authority, which is but secondary; he deserves therefore but inferior consideration. With a slight alteration he may fairly appro-

priate, as applicable to his own condition, the well-known maxim of the lawyers, "*Non* facit per se quod facit *pro* alio." He is simply the agent and instrument of another's will. He seems to stand in pretty much the same relation to the Incumbent of the parish where he serves as the apprentice to his master, the clerk to the members of the firm in whose office he is employed, nay, almost the domestic servant towards the head of the household. The Incumbent is said to 'keep a Curate,' as he keeps a footman or a gardener, or even a carriage and a horse. And, like any other hireling, the Curate may at any time be called upon to receive his due wages, and be discharged.

VI.—EFFECT UPON THE CURATE'S CHARACTER.

It is not surprising, then, that highly educated, ardent, and sensitive minds should, after a time, feel somewhat keenly the indignity of the situation, and indulge, often too eagerly perhaps, an honourable ambition for preferment to a post in the Church of higher social consideration. No doubt a great deal of restlessness and discontent among the younger Clergy is occasioned by this trial; and, if it be protracted to a later stage in life, there is no little danger of the feeling settling down into habitual sourness, despondency, and heartlessness in pastoral work. The wonder rather is, that such is not more frequently the case. Still it often happens, and is a serious hindrance, no doubt, and one considerable cause of our Church's pastoral inefficiency.

VII.—OTHER ALLEGED WRONGS.

But the alleged wrongs of Curates are of a far more material kind than this merely sentimental depreciation. Many a well-nurtured self-restrained spirit, more than content to take the lowest room, and be if only a doorkeeper in the House of GOD, nay, willing enough, should the occasion demand such a sacrifice, to be defamed as "the filth of the world," and "offscouring of all things," in the glorious company and goodly fellowship of the Apostles and Prophets, without the smallest sense of degradation, but rather with an earnest feeling of elevation and holy pride, do yet very grievously smart and fret under certain actual hardships incident to the present anomalous condition of their office. It may be well to consider *seriatim* the most prominent of these, with the view, if possible, of discovering their remedies.

1. *Uncertain Tenure of the Curate's Office.*

A reference has already been made to one of the most obvious and urgent—the *uncertain tenure* of the Curate's office. This trial, no doubt, falls with aggravated severity upon the married Clergy. The proverbial "three moves as bad as a fire," is more than verified in their case, because there is no opportunity of insurance against the contingency, and there is the anxious apprehension of continual further changes yet to come. Unbeneficed clergymen, with large families, are not unfrequently on this account altogether precluded from entering upon a regular Curacy, which would involve a change of residence, and oftener than not, refurnishing a house, with the uncertain prospect of being obliged, by the death of the Incumbent or other cause, shortly to vacate and move again. Settling down, therefore, in some residence of their own, they prefer the lesser risk of making out a precarious livelihood by occasional clerical employment, or taking pupils, or literary or any other secular work. This is one valid reason why even an incumbency of smaller money value is considered by so many clergymen preferable to a well-paid Curacy. But the often intolerable expense of continual changes is not the only, or perhaps most harassing grievance arising out of the precariousness of official tenure. There are others which tell equally upon the married and unmarried clergy. Every change involves the double trial of abandoning a certain and familiar sphere of duty, and anxiously seeking another altogether untried, and the suitability of which has yet to be proved by experience. All pastoral work at present in hand has summarily to be suspended, incomplete undertakings still in progress to be left unfinished, the labour of months or years, just beginning to yield fruits of recompense, to be surrendered to another; friends whose confidence and affection have been hardly and gradually won, to be parted from; souls with difficulty reached, and now doubly endeared by accepted spiritual ministrations, to be forsaken. And then the same uphill labour of love has to be entered upon anew from the beginning, among strangers and in unaccustomed ways of proceeding, and that, too, with the same sure prospect before long of sudden and untimely interruption. It certainly does demand a more than ordinary amount of sanguine temperament and constitutional energy to go through a succession of such changes with unabated perseverance. A conscientious sense of duty is apt in the third or fourth Curacy to flag a little, and grow satisfied with a punctual discharge of routine

and perfunctory obligations, and to shrink from spontaneous advances in Church work which may so soon be peremptorily cut short. There is no more common, nor perhaps more saddening sight, than to see men, hopeful and active at the beginning of their clerical career, sink down, contentedly or discontentedly, into a permanent mental state of spiritless despondency and *laisser faire*, until the habit wholly unfits them for the responsibilities of a higher office in the Church, even if eventually, in GOD'S Providence, such should be their calling.

2. *His Relations to the Incumbent.*

Not a little, of course, in this respect must depend on the good understanding and thorough cordiality of the Assistant-Curate and his superior in the parish, especially when the Incumbent is also resident. But at best the present undefined relation between the two is very unsatisfactory, and a chief cause of disagreeableness and disaffection in the position of the former. No doubt it would be extremely difficult so to adjust the relation as to give equal satisfaction to both parties. It is certain, however, that the entire dependence and absolute subordination of the Curate's status, as it exists at present, is a rife source of jealousy, discontentment, indecision of purpose, and, unhappily, not seldom of positive rivalry and antagonism, on one side or the other, or on both. Nor practically is the Bishop's licence any safeguard in this respect. The rank of Incumbent and Curate remains, notwithstanding, relatively the same, not only in popular estimation, as was treated of above, but actually as regards the choice and regulation of all the details of parochial management. The National Schoolmaster has really a more definite sphere of official duty assigned to him, and more liberty of discretion and independence of action within it, than the Curate. Nothing but a thorough *entente cordiale*, or mutual respect, sympathy, good temper, patience, forbearance, and slowness to take offence, can ensure a healthy and effective co-operation in the joint pastoral work, and security from undue encroachment upon and interference with one another's duties. But one must fear that an oversensitive or overbearing temper, caprice, self-willedness, forward zeal (it may be not according to knowledge) on one side, timidity or dilatoriness, or characteristic eccentricity on the other, are not rare exceptions to the rule of hearty co-operation. The fault, probably, is as often on one side as the other; but the Curate, of course, as the weakest, goes to the wall. And the *feeling* of entire subordination and consequent irresponsibility, coupled

with the insecurity of office above noted, acts as a still further opiate upon his flagging energies. Many a man well fitted, under more independent and congenial circumstances, to make an excellent Parish Priest, has thus declined into habitual dryness and commonplace character, from sheer lack of free play for his genius and active temper. While the indecision of purpose, division of counsels, and paralyzed action so ensuing, must result in the feeblest movement of the pulse and mainspring of parochial Church-work.

3. *His Relation to the Bishop.*

Nor is the episcopal relation more encouraging. There is a theory indeed, the principle of which is recognized and embodied in our Thirty-third Canon of 1603, that every Deacon and Priest ordained into the Church of a diocese has such an inherent claim upon it for maintenance in all necessary things that, failing this otherwise, the Bishop is bound to provide them for him, as a father for his children, or a parish for its destitute poor, "till he do prefer him to some Ecclesiastical living[1]." Practically, however, we know full well that the Bishops, on the other hand, both claim and exercise the right of absolutely refusing licence to a Curacy, and of cancelling a licence without assigning any reason, and of interdicting the unbeneficed clergyman from officiating in any parish of a diocese. The right indeed is here advisedly limited to *claim* and *exercise;* for the writer cannot but think that such an extreme injustice *in posse,* not to say *in esse,* is not left by English law and equity uncontrolled and absolute, as a singular instance of a wrong without a remedy; and that, if challenged by *quo warranto,* or other proper process in a Civil Court, any such arbitrary deprivation of livelihood would oblige the agent to show cause, and obtain for the sufferer legal redress. There is no need invidiously to quote actual instances of the

[1] A smart and clever brochure, entitled *The Church of England from a New Point of View* (Longmans, 1866), says amusingly on this subject, "Laymen will hardly believe that one of the Canons expressly forbids the ordination of any man, except where sufficient maintenance can be found for him; enjoining the Bishop to support his nominee till he can find him preferment, in case the supposed maintenance should prove inadequate. Of course, by a subtle piece of legal ingenuity, this Canon is practically evaded; yet, in spite of this evasion, the Canon (if I remember rightly, the Thirty-third) stands in silent witness. How the penny papers would rejoice if a score of Curates appeared at the Bishop's gate, and, after presenting their cards and compliments, begged to partake of his lordship's hospitality, till he could find them a benefice!"

abuse of the assumed power. The capability of abuse is the grievance now insisted on. It cannot be seriously argued that the liability is chimerical. It may indeed at any time be abused to the most cowardly and shameful party purposes. It would be scarcely possible, in fact, to go beyond the grave recommendation of an elected Proctor in the Lower House of Convocation, safely entrenched within the freehold of his own comfortable benefice, who calmly suggests that the hypothetical power in question should be used as a screw, where the law allows liberty, for the suppression of certain ceremonial distasteful to the speaker, and the enforcement of "the simple ritual transmitted to us by our Protestant forefathers." "In such cases," he says, "we may fairly expect their lordships to exercise a little autocratic vigour in discouraging and suppressing these objectionable practices. Admonitions and remonstrances may be followed by reprimand; and when the latter is still disregarded, it is not unreasonable to expect that the *least severe exercise of Episcopal power should be resorted to, the suspending or cancelling of the licences of Curates of contumacious Incumbents.* Such a step would, of course, immediately provoke an appeal to the Primate, and thus secure a speedy settlement of the question[1]!" Not a word, surely, need be added in proof of the existing grievance. Something hereafter may be said on the Ecclesiastical aspect of the question. But, on grounds of civil politics, it must be noted here that the refusal or withdrawal of a Curate's licence amounts in fact to a penalty upon a criminal, and that of all British subjects, including murderers and robbers, the Curate only is put without the pale of the Common Law, and is subject to condemnation and punishment without trial.

4. *Curates not represented in Convocation.*

This instance, however, is suggestive of another substantial ground of complaint on the part of Curates, which may be suitably noticed here. Though numerically so large a section of the Clergy, they are the only class, at least nominally, unrepresented by a voice in Convocation. One can imagine that if their grievances found vent there in ever so feeble an utterance the self-complacent "putting down" and "breeches-pocket" argument above referred to, so worthy of a late civic magnate,

[1] *Ritualism: a Plea for the Surplice.* The substance of a speech delivered in the Lower House of Convocation, June 28, 1866. By the Rev. Sir H. Thompson, Bart., Proctor for the Diocese of Chichester. 1866.

would surely not have been suffered to escape without censure and reprisal; and that, if their free and independent suffrages had really a due value in the election of Proctors for the diocese —a condition, however, which cannot be predicated without much qualification of their beneficed brethren in the Priesthood—their choice probably would not have fallen on a representative who could condescend to such extreme unfairness in turning their (on Ecclesiastical and civil principles) *unconstitutional* disadvantage-ground into a weapon of party warfare and oppression.

5. *Length of Service without Preferment.*

The pith and gist of these and other grievances, it has all along been supposed, consist in a *prolonged* exposure to them. If the disadvantages of the Curate's office were limited to Deacons and young inexperienced Priests, for the first few years of their clerical career, no complaint could be justly made about them. It is when the middle-aged Priest, however able, active, earnest he is and may have been, is supplanted by younger men, who are promoted over his head, simply in order that the latter may receive the social position and income attached to certain work, which the former, for many years perhaps, has been performing most efficiently, but with only the barest worldly remuneration—then it is that the inequality of the present system, and, it must be added, the indignity of the Curates' status, begin to tell with sensible effect. In not a few cases, the precious gift of health has been sacrificed by overwork at an early stage of pastoral duties. But the poor Priest is still repeatedly turned adrift, and driven from pillar to post, and obliged to work for his living in the same subordinate office, without the means of providing, in his turn, for the maintenance of a coadjutor who would share the duties with him, which weigh upon his conscience as moral obligations, but which his failing strength is more and more unequal to accomplish. He must still work either alone, in what is called a sole charge, or subject to the caprice and idiosyncracy of another. He feels that while, during his early career, he was too young, and green, and volatile to expect promotion to a more dignified and responsible position, he has now suddenly got too old, and *passé*, and inactive to be ostensibly eligible for such preferment. And then there is the later epoch in the Curate's life, when infirmity, if not sickness, grows upon him, and he is more and more incapacitated for conscientiously undertaking a post which would entitle him to sufficient remuneration, while still he might serve a small Curacy

or chaplaincy, and adequately discharge its routine duties, but with a stipend too little for his maintenance. Here the Church, which he has been serving faithfully all his life, ungratefully deserts him. She has none but casual provision for superannuation and old age. There is no discharge from this warfare, no 'selling out,' nor half-pay, nor pension, except accidentally from private bounty, on which the no longer able-bodied veterans can retire from active service. This does seem a very serious blot, amounting to positive injustice, on the surface of our present system, and may well serve as a climax to the *gravamina Curatorum*.

VIII.—AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A CURATE.

And here is the best place, perhaps, for bringing forward a *de facto* example in further illustration of the actual working of the system. It is in the form of a private letter from an experienced Parish Priest of long standing, and still a Curate, who had a large acquaintance among his brother Clergy, and very favourable opportunities of observation, for many years past; and which was written in reply to an inquiry on the subject. It may be more expressive if left as it stands in the original, with its first person and direct manner, the writer of this Essay only standing sponsor for its authenticity:—

"Yes! you are quite right in supposing that more than a quarter of century has galloped away since I first 'entered the Church,' as the phrase then ran for receiving Holy Orders. So I can look back upon myself at that distance quite impartially, as on another person. I was ten years at a public school, and went thence with an Exhibition of 100*l.* per annum to Oxford. In 1840, I took my B.A., and was ordained Deacon on Trinity Sunday, 1841, by the late Bishop of London, at S. Paul's, and Priest the following year. My title was a junior curacy (100*l.* a year), one of four, at a large West-end Church, with a parish very rich and very poor, of about 12,000 people. The Incumbent was one of the old school of London Rectors, of course High-and-Dry, receiving some 1,500*l.* of Church-income (he had a second living in the country), with a rich wife; residing, during the season, at a grand mansion in a fashionable square; occasionally preaching, dispensing the Offertory-alms (hoarded up for the purpose) at Christmas, and officiating at marriages of the *élite*. I only once, I think, entered his house during my two years' Curacy, on an invitation to dine with him, and am impressed to this day with the recollection of the double row of

liveried and powdered footmen who received me at the entrance, and passed my name upstairs. Poor soul! he has long since gone to his account. *Requiem æternam dona ei, Domine: et lux perpetua luceat ei.*

"Repeated changes of dynasty have since then taken place in the scene of my earliest campaign. Meantime, I worked hard at visiting and sermon-writing, and saw a good deal of London life. It was a prominent position, and I made very valuable acquaintances, which have never failed me. But the work altogether was not quite congenial. After serving my title, I tendered my resignation, which was accepted forthwith, at the end of the second year. The Bishop of London had been very kind to me at the time of my Ordination. He took me out with him for a walk in the Park, questioning and advising me on many points of preliminary Divinity. I was now full of buoyant hope and zeal; and, somewhat romantically perhaps, on tendering my resignation, I wrote to the good Bishop asking him to send me any where in the world he pleased, wherever he thought I could be of most service. I was quite in earnest, and remember the sort of awe with which I awaited his reply. I fully expected that he would send me to the West Coast of Africa, the West Indies, or some other unhealthy climate. However, when no answer came for some time, I felt at liberty to look out for myself, and accepted the offer of a Curacy in the country. The very day after, I think, the Bishop wrote, inviting me to London House. I told him the circumstances of my engagement, and he fully concurred in my acceptance of the Curacy. What else he had designed for me I never learned.

"My Cure now was in a large central market town; but besides the Curacy, I was Chaplain to the Union Workhouse and County Infirmary. My stipend altogether was upwards of 150*l*. For seven years I worked here 'like a horse.' On Sundays, I never had less than six and sometimes seven full services, morning and evening, with four written sermons: viz. two (sometimes three) services with one sermon at Church; two (with one sermon in each ward) at Infirmary; two (with one sermon) at Workhouse; besides Sunday School; and every Sunday half-a-dozen poor old men and women used to dine at my table. We (the Vicar and self) had also one *daily* service in Church; and on Wednesday and Friday at the Infirmary and Workhouse. There was, of course, plenty of visiting of poor and sick in all these departments. During the time of my Curacy I said the Burial Office over no less than seven hundred departed. Then there were the schools (boys, girls, and infants)

to attend to. Building new schools and raising subscriptions for the restoration of the beautiful parish Church took up a good deal of our time and energies. I was made Secretary to Committees for this purpose, and also of the district associations of S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. I established a new depôt for the former, and by a new system of accounts and new subscriptions recovered some long-standing arrears of debt to the parent Society. The keeping of accounts, and organization of new parochial associations, and acting as "deputation," was no sinecure. The central position of the town, and the frequent meetings, civil and ecclesiastical, in the parish, brought me into intercourse with most of the country gentlemen and clergy of the county. I moreover established a County Architectural and Archæological Society, which is still flourishing, and got many of them to join it, and was made Secretary of that also. My correspondence was necessarily very considerable. I should add also, that in those days religious party-feeling ran higher than even now, and from my prominent position I got to be regarded as a sort of leader in local movements. On occasion of the Hampden controversy I remember having no less than ninety letters by post, relating to the question and a proposed meeting on the subject, in three successive days. I chiefly wrote at night, and at this time published a volume of Lectures and another of Sermons, besides doing occasional literary work. For a long time I kept a night school of some twenty big lads, single-handed; and had a full share in working the usual town-parish institutions, such as Savings' Banks, Lending Library, Board of Health, &c. Altogether my hands were full; and what with religious controversy, and not seldom hot water with the Guardians (the Board representing no less than forty parishes, and perhaps most of its members being Dissenters) I had, as you may imagine, a good deal of wear and tear.

"How I got through it all I often now wonder, but I was obliged to give in at last. I am afraid that I then injured my constitution, and unfitted myself for hard work in after years. Certainly I have never had quite so busy a time of it since. It was however the happiest and, if I may venture to judge, the most useful period of my life. In 1847 I was a candidate for the Secretaryship of the National Society, and was amongst those selected for final choice, but ultimately was not elected. I was however fortunate enough to get commendatory testimonials from three of the then most influential Bishops: viz. the late Bishop Blomfield, who ordained me, Bishop Kaye of Lincoln, and a third still living. As I know that I may safely

trust you to preserve strictly my *incog.* in any use which you may make of this letter, and as it is of importance to your purpose to show that hard work and fair character are no certain passports to preferment under our present system, without some further private claim of special personal interest, I will quote in full one of these Episcopal testimonials:—

"'I have received to-day from the Rev.——— Curate of——— a request that I would send to you letters testimonial as to his fitness for the office at Westminster. I esteem Mr. ———very highly. I think him a man of very considerable powers of mind; of great faculties for the discharge of business; of great method, order, and clearness; of ready arrangement and patient in laying out of plans. He is very laborious, self-denying, and I think humble minded. He is a High Churchman. He is on conviction and as the result of sound knowledge on matters theological, strongly opposed to the claims and doctrines of the Roman Communion. I should esteem him singularly fitted for such employment as belongs to the office which he seeks.'

"It may be useful also to add one more of several to the same effect (thank God,) bearing the same date, from an influential layman, an Assistant Poor Law Commissioner since deceased.

"'Having been given to understand that the Rev. ——— is a Candidate for the appointment of additional Secretary to the National Society, and having for some years had the pleasure of his acquaintance, whilst a Magistrate resident near ———; and being officially brought into communication with him, as Chairman of the Board of Guardians of the ——— Union, to the Workhouse of which he was Chaplain; I have much pleasure in stating the high estimation that I entertain of his general ability, and in bearing testimony to the high character which he bore in my neighbourhood, and to his correct habits of business, and to the zeal and efficiency with which he performed the duties undertaken by him.'

"Failing thus in my candidature, I still went on working in the same field as before for two more years, till 1849. Meantime, the Bishop who had most kindly given me so favourable a testimonial offered me a small country Living in his gift, but with so straitened an income (I think then 40*l.*, though it has since increased) that, having no private means of my own, I *could not* accept it. I would also just mention here, by anticipation of many years, that the same, my kind and only patron, subsequently offered me another, but which also, after the necessary deductions for working a large parish (or rather two in one), would have left a considerably less stipend than an ordinary Curacy, and that,

having others then dependent on me, I was again obliged to decline it. With these two exceptions (I may state here once for all) I have never had any offer of preferment.

"At the end of 1849, I resigned my town Curacy and Chaplaincies, and took the sole charge of a little country parish with the Chaplaincy of an adjoining town workhouse; stipend for the two 130*l*. It was a beautiful and healthy spot, and, after my late turmoil, a very Paradise of peace. I enjoyed it however only a year; and then, to meet an emergency at that troublous time of 'Papal Aggression,' the end of 1850, I went as Curate to a friend in London who needed special help, and was again licensed by the good Bishop who had ordained me. Here my stipend was 60*l*. with board and lodging. I once more occupied a somewhat prominent position in a popular Church, and a post of great responsibility and anxious labour, which brought me into close spiritual relationship with a large number of new acquaintances.

"My pastoral experience in the guidance of individual souls was thus greatly raised both in quantity and quality. Our ordinary ministrations were continual, early and late. The times were very exciting, and religious controversy ran high. Mind and body had very little rest. So that in the course of three years my health again gave way, and I was brought under a physician's hand. My medical adviser recommended a sea voyage; and this, coupled with other coincident circumstances which I interpreted as a Providential call, induced me to accompany some relatives to a distant colony. I did so at the close of 1853, and in the thirteenth year of my Holy Orders. I carried with me the following voucher from my venerated Diocesan, addressed to the Bishop of the Colony whither I was bound.

"'My Lord, I beg to recommend to your Lordship's fatherly care and counsel the Reverend ———, a Presbyter of my Diocese, in which he has been for some years past a zealous Curate.

'I am, my Lord,
'Yr. Lordship's faithful friend and brother,
'C. J. London.'

"It was subsequently returned to me endorsed as follows: 'In further attestation of the above character from 1854 to 1859, during which time the Rev. ——— officiated as Minister of ——— Church' (with signature of Colonial Bishop). My first year in the Colony was spent in the 'bush;' but feeding chiefly on rice, potatoes, and tea, and sleeping sometimes out of doors on the swampy banks of rivers, and commonly in a grass hut, was more than I was able to bear long. I returned to the Port-town and

was appointed to one of the Churches there, with 280*l.* stipend; which added to other payments for some private pupils, raised my income to 600*l.* Considering the cost of house-rent, fuel, servants' wages, and other necessaries, this was practically not equivalent to half the same amount in England; and I had to board some of my pupils. But I was still only a licensed Curate; and when a new parochial system, tantamount to the purest Congregationalism, was enacted by the local Synod, I was required to resign, in order to election by my own flock, and dependence on their voluntary payments in the way of subscriptions and pew-rents. I could not stomach this, and returned to England at the beginning of 1860. Meantime, in the Colony, I had taken to myself a wife, and had gained experience in a new field of pastoral labour, and very materially improved my health by the sea voyage and change of climate.

"On landing in England I found a temporary charge already provided for me by my friends for three months—again a large suburban parish and workhouse. This enabled me to look out for a more permanent Cure, which I shortly met with in the parish of a Church Dignitary, who was Rector, and resided in the village. A cottage and 100*l.* was the stipend.

"And here I may as well record two observations to the purpose of your inquiry, which came under my notice at this time, when looking out for the Curacy.

"(1) When I returned from abroad, after nearly seven years' absence, and *in my twentieth year of Orders*, the kind friends who were interested in securing for me a suitable provision and occupation, or some of them, distinctly warned me that my age would prove a difficulty in the way of obtaining any eligible Church office; that younger men would be considered preferable for most clerical appointments. I certainly found it to be so, even in the case of several vacant secretaryships for which I applied, and for which I should have thought maturity of judgment and experience were, *cæteris paribus*, the very highest qualifications. In parish work naturally, it is almost always felt that the Curate should be younger than the resident Incumbent; a consideration which of course adds with an ever-increasing ratio to the difficulty of finding such an opening as life advances. This, however is a most important point to be borne in mind by those who are interested in improving the position and prospects of Stipendiary Curates.

"(2) At the same time it is remarkable I received from no less than four separate and independent quarters (friends and relatives), a distinct warning against accepting a Curacy in one particular diocese. The reason alleged by all was substantially

the same, and is very curious; viz. that the Bishop plumed himself in filling up all the important posts within his patronage with men either of worldly rank and title, or else of private fortune, for the good of the Church; and that, as I had neither, there was little or no prospect of my being taken Episcopally by the hand[1]. Now this opinion, no doubt, amounts to caricature; but a caricature after all is only an exaggeration of the truth. Any how, the opinion largely prevails; and indeed, I thought that I myself recollected instances of the kind, seemingly growing up into a rule, even before I had left England; but which, surely, so far as they should become a recognized principle in our system of Episcopal patronage, would, in my humble judgment, be an enormous practical error. You know my long-standing conviction that we clergy are regarded far too much as 'gentlefolks' already; and that whatever advantage we might so gain in a neighbourhood in the way of social position among the squirearchy, is far more than counterbalanced by the loss of *spiritual* influence among our own people, especially in the middle and lower ranks of life. Besides, the principle has an obvious bearing on the chances of preferment for the earnest and hard-working Curate without fortune or handle to his name. That is to say, in short, that he has so much less prospect of preferment to a living in proportion as (on worldly grounds) he needs it most.

"I continued four years in this peaceful little village, spent happily, though uneventfully enough; uneventfully, but for the birth of two children into my family, and consequently the further charge upon my thoughts and household expenses. I may mention too, that during the very short interval, no less than three Bishops successively presided over the diocese in which the parish is situated, with all of whom I was more or less brought

[1] This is no new complaint in the Church, as to abuse in the exercise of patronage. The following reads almost as if it were an extract from some correspondent in yesterday's *Times*:—"One says, 'Let him be appointed because he is of an excellent family;' and another, 'Because he is possessed of great wealth, and would not need to be supported out of the revenues of the Church;' and another, 'Because he has ventured among us from our enemies.' One is jealous to promote in honour before others, the man that is intimately acquainted with him; another, him that is related to him by family ties; and another, the man that flatters him. Nobody will look out for the man that is qualified, nor make any trial of soul." Again:—"Why forsooth, have they overlooked those who have endured abundant drudgery for the service of the Church, but all at once exalted to this honour one who never tasted labours of this sort, and wasted all his youth in the vain pursuit of external learning." S. John Chrysostom *On the Priesthood* (translated by B. Harris Cowper; Williams and Norgate, 1866) chap. viii. 158. xv. 273.

into personal contact. These raised the number of Bishops under whom I had served since Ordination to eight. I should have continued there probably to this day, but that a little more than two years ago, I was unexpectedly invited by the Squire of a very small parish in another diocese, to undertake the sole charge of the same, with a stipend of 120*l.* and the use of the Rectory-house furnished. The Rector was a pluralist and non-resident. I accepted the offer, as you know, and am now licensed to the latter office, though of course liable any day, by the death of the Rector, to be again turned adrift in quest of another Curacy. My kind parishioners in the village I last quitted most generously presented me and my wife with a handsome present, as a joint contribution in token of their regret at parting from us. We sold our furniture, and with the proceeds managed to cover the expense of moving here.

"And now you have the full history of my Curatehood. I do not know that it presents any but average and most common-place experience. It will answer your purpose all the better on that account. You ask for any remarks with reference to the system suggestive of its effect upon my personal feelings and official character. I cannot be thankful enough for the happiness and contentment I have enjoyed thoughout. But for one short interval, my clerical life has been full of unbroken peace and comfort. At an early stage of it I somewhat overtasked my strength, but, with God's blessing, I have always had sufficient health to go through a fair amount of duties. To this very day I have, single-handed, seventeen Church services every week; and the Lent before last, I preached forty sermons besides. You know that I have long held the somewhat peculiar view that Curates have no great hardship to complain of in the way of payment. I have always had enough, and often more than enough, from my official income, for necessaries and even luxuries—luxuries such as plenty of books, and means for occasionally making a tour in England or on the Continent. Nay, I have been all round the world without any extra pecuniary assistance. When I married, my wife had a small sum of money, the interest of which, added to my stipend, occasional gifts from relatives, and now and then payments for literary work, has been sufficient to keep us and our children in respectability and comfort. I suppose every Curate could do as well in this way, if he chose to undertake the same amount of duties, and were prudent in money matters. Certainly I have no peculiar interest or advantages which would distinguish me from others in this respect.

"You ask me my opinion of the Curates' Augmentation Fund.

I think thus:—I presume that I am as fairly entitled as any one to a share in its disbursements. Of course I shall not take it unkindly to receive an additional 100*l.* a year. It will, no doubt, materially help to grease the wheels of our life's chariot. It may add some items to my wine-merchant's bill and other medical comforts. It may enable me to keep a pony; or even to run down to the sea with my family for a summer's holiday. But I am not so sure that the Church will be a bit the gainer by all this. I suppose that I should not do an additional hour's work in the course of the year, nor what I did more efficiently. I only hope that it might not add to one's temptations to spend more time in self-indulgent recreations; no doubt, I should have so much more money at my disposal to spend in private charity, or in Church work, and I might feel inclined possibly, to 'keep a Curate' myself. There would therefore be a possibility of thus much gain to the general cause. But I do not see that the so-called 'grievances' of Curates would be in any degree lessened by it. And there is this very curious anomaly about it, that, if the time should come when increasing infirmity might throw me out of regular work, and it would be a real charity to supplement my dwindling official income, just at that critical emergency the Augmentation Fund fails me[1]. I am afraid too there is some little danger of its adding to the practical difficulties of the present system. I suppose, almost every one would rather remain

[1] This difficulty is fully admitted by the Provisional Committee of the Augmentation Fund: "Nothing can be worse than the position of a clergyman who, after many years' service, has failed to obtain preferment. At comparatively short intervals he is almost sure to have to break up his home, and at great expense to remove, possibly to some distant part of the country; whilst owing to the preference naturally given to younger men, he finds himself obliged, on each change to accept a still more inadequate rate of remuneration than before." *The Position and Prospects of Stipendiary Curates* (published by order of the Provisional Council), p. 13. Nor is the objection satisfactorily answered by the following plea: "To have extended the movement in the direction indicated would have given to the benefit conferred so much of an eleemosynary character, as to have weakened, if not destroyed, that which is essential in the whole plan: viz. that what is received is received, *not as eleemosynary dole, but as well-earned and absolute right.*" *Ibid.* p. 17. The fallacy here is, that a Curate's amount of stipend is the gauge of his efficiency and deserts, and that past labours are not taken into the calculation, as having "well earned" an "absolute right" of present remuneration. It must be added however, that a 'discretion' is reserved to the Committee of Management by the 6th Clause of "the Constitution" under which the Fund is held in trust, for continuing grants in exceptional cases; a satisfactory arrangement enough, were not "discretion" liable, if not to abuse, to the suspicion and imputation of it.

a Curate with 200*l.* a year than undertake the responsibility of an Incumbency of a populous district with 100*l.* or thereabouts. The difficulty too of obtaining Curates under 100*l.* will be enormously increased to poor Incumbents. Altogether, I own that I do not perceive any sound principle in the plan likely to prove of much practical benefit; and some of its details appear to me objectionable.

"But you know that I have long been an ultra-Radical on this whole question of clerical emoluments, and am strongly of opinion that the root of evil in the present system is not so much the under-payment of the Curates, as the enormous over-payment in most instances, by comparison, of Incumbents, who, to say the least, do no larger amount of work, but get the lion's share of pay for it. This inequality and abuse of Church endowments to purposes of private aggrandisement, I consider to be a main cause of our so-called 'ministerial inefficiency' and of the prevailing worldliness of the National Church. I fervently believe that any amount of spoliation or alienation of revenues so enormously abused and inequitably appropriated, though at the cost of the Church's dis-establishment and separation from the State, would be an exceeding gain, on the whole, to the spiritual vitality of the Church's ministrations. For myself, I repeat, I should be more than content to go on all my days in such a Curacy as I hold at present, though, as life advances, I am growing somewhat weary of repeated change. Thank God, I think that I may very honestly say at any rate, that I have been neither soured nor embittered by lack of preferment to a benefice. I do not know that I ever really wished to have it. But at least I have a most implicit confidence in the truth and wisdom of the Psalmist's maxim: 'Promotion cometh neither from the east nor from the west, nor yet from the south: and why? *God is the Judge;* He putteth down one and setteth up another.' Had He willed it otherwise, it would have been so. But He has spared me the responsibility of larger opportunities. And to friends who have urged me more than once to apply for a vacant living—a persuasion, however, which I trust that I may never be induced to yield to—I have sometimes pointed out a pithy and sententious passage in one of Paley's *Sermons*, addressed to the younger clergy on the subject, which is worth quoting, both for the suggestion's sake, and as a not unapt conclusion to this unavoidably egotistical 'story of a life.' 'Pursue preferment,' (he says), 'if any prospects of it present themselves, not only by honourable means, but with moderate anxiety. It is not essential to happiness, perhaps not very conducive: were it of greater importance than it is, no more successful rule could be

given you, than to do your duty quietly and contentedly, and to let things take their course. You may have been brought up with different notions, but be assured, that for once that preferment is forfeited by modesty, it is ten times lost by intrusion and importunity. Every one sympathizes with neglected merit, but who shall lament over repulsed impudence?[1]'

"Yours faithfully, —— ——."

IX.—ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF ANOMALIES IN PRESENT SYSTEM.

The anomalies and inequalities of the present system, so justly complained of in the above letter, are, no doubt, mainly the consequence of its hap-hazard and accidental growth. The condition of Curates, in the sense of unbeneficed working Clergy, has been an abuse from the beginning. It is part and parcel of the anomalous and unsymmetrical character generally of the English parochial system, with its private patronage, lay impropriations, unequal endowments, and legalized sale of livings[2]. In the Pre-Reformation period, a large proportion of the parish churches, with the emoluments, was attached to Religious

[1] Paley's *Works*, Vol. iv. Sermon 2, on 1 Tim. iv. 12. But whatever may be the duty or wisdom of individual clergymen, it affords no pretext or excuse for the many abuses of the present system. Is the following an exaggeration of them? "I would not wish you to be hoodwinked by plausible stories respecting the promotion of clergymen. Do not listen to the legends of this or that clergyman, whose exemplary labours have been handsomely and gratuitously rewarded. Distrust all such deceitful glosses and explanations. Merit is certainly rewarded within the Church. In saying this, I would not be understood to affirm that any clergyman by dint of laborious pastoral work, could reach preferment worth having. After much experience and the investigation of many cases, I have not found a single example of such fortune. Valuable preferment is bestowed, when in public patronage, upon relatives or political allies. Private patrons, who have no connections to reward, sell their preferment. Doubtless there are exceptions to this rule. I have never met with one." *Church of England from New Point of View*, p. 49.

[2] To what a great and unblushing extent the latter abuse has grown, may be inferred from the advertisements in every month's *Ecclesiastical Gazette*. "It is no secret that benefices are sold when they are worth selling. One agent, I am told, advertises between three and four hundred to intending purchasers, while every country solicitor transacts occasionally the quiet transfer of a neighbouring living. I know a neighbourhood where a radius of three miles touches eight parishes. The charge of five of these was acquired by purchase, two were not worth buying (they were rewards of merit), and the last was unsaleable, in the patronage of a Bishop, and held by a Bishop's chaplain" (*Church of England*, &c. p. 50). A new form of simoniacal purchase of the cure of souls has within the last few years sprung up under Episcopal connivance, the presentee to a benefice undertaking to lay out so much money on the church, schools, or parsonage of the parish.

Houses, and served by the Brethren, either sent from the central monastery or from some affiliated cell. On the spoliation of the monasteries, this portion of the spoil passed into the hands chiefly of the Crown, or of Crown Officers and favourites, or of Cathedral and Collegiate Corporations. Hence the private-property character, generally, of English Church Endowments. Then followed, through a long series of corrupt and irreligious ages, every possible abuse and malversation that nepotism, jobbery, and covetousness could devise [1]. These reached their climax, perhaps, in the unlimited accumulation of pluralities. Pluralities necessitated the non-residence of Incumbents, and in substitution, the race of stipendiary and licensed Curates, just as lay impropriations had already originated the legal office of Vicars and Perpetual Curates [2]. The first-mentioned were only a further development of the latter abuse, and like it, were connived at by the Bishops, and eventually recognized and regulated by the law. Temporary as well as Perpetual Curates, and Lecturers again, another form of the same abuse, are presupposed as existing, and allowed in the Canons of 1603; and a piece-meal civil legislation has kept pace with the varying exigencies of the office, the growth of a corrupt custom, and determined its relation to the Bishop and Incumbent. So is it, that a congeries of prevalent abuses has culminated and become stereotyped in the present vicious system, with all its manifold anomalies and injustice to the subjects of it, and to the very serious spiritual deterioration of the English Church.

X.—THEORY OF PAROCHIAL ENDOWMENTS.

For what is the true theory of Parochial Endowments, when we come to analyze and contemplate it in its naked principles?

[1] The history is most pungently related, though with some inaccuracies and exaggeration, in Cobbett's *Legacy to Parsons*, published so recently as 1835, and which every one studying the subject should read. Of pluralities, he says: "There are *three hundred and thirty-two persons*, who have amongst them the revenues of *fourteen hundred and ninety-six* parishes. There are several persons, who are either peers or the relatives of peers, who have each *six* benefices, at the least, including their cathedral preferment." He specifies several, with their pieces of preferment, and adds: "As to the authority upon which I state these things, I take them from a book printed by Rivington of S. Paul's Church-yard, entitled the *Clerical Guide*, and published in 1829, that being the last edition" (*Legacy to Parsons, Letter V.*). After a late exposure of the incumbencies at present on the foundation of one of our northern cathedrals, can we say that these iniquities have wholly past away?

[2] See Burn's *Ecclesiastical Law*, under head of 'Curates.'

Benefices, no doubt, in their first intention, were simply for the maintenance of local ministrations. But ministrations imply a minister; and, according to the Scripture proverb, the labourer is worthy of his hire, and the ox must not be muzzled that treadeth out the corn. "Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the Altar are partakers with the Altar? Even so *hath the Lord ordained* that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 7. 13, 14). The maintenance, then, of the Clergy in all necessary charges for lodging, furniture, clothing, food, fuel, journeying, &c., is a positive Divine law, as well as a law of natural religion. Parochial Endowments were a provision accordingly to secure the ministrations of a Parish Priest. In their original foundation, we may presume, they were generally adequate to their purpose, but would rarely go beyond it, though probably with various degrees of liberality in allowance. In many cases, as was remarked above, the benefices were attached to Religious Houses, which undertook to supply the ministrations. The emoluments in this case were paid to the common fund of *Domus,* out of which the Brethren sent to serve the parish would derive their maintenance. In other cases provision was made for a resident Parish Priest. But in both kinds, the intention was simply the supply of local ministrations, and to this end, a sufficiency for the necessary minister or ministers. We may further assume that property once thus solemnly appropriated to the service of Almighty God was irrecoverable by the donor, nor without sacrilege alienable to any private or secular uses. The donor may in many cases have reserved a right of patronage and presentation to the living; but, by his act of dedication, he had absolutely resigned all interest in the property as such, and made it over to the Church for the maintenance of God's service. A clear perception of the original purpose of Church endowments is necessary to a due appreciation of the scandalous contrast presented in the actual working of the system. Lay impropriation, as was stated above, was the first practical abnegation of the principle. Then the parallel abuse of *sinecures,* in the case of appropriations held by spiritual persons. In the case of private patronage, now so largely extended by the late alienation of Chancellor's livings, the legalized sale of next presentations and advowsons is based on a presumed right of the patron's money-interest in the freehold estate. Thus, as so often

happens, when the purchaser himself becomes the presentee, the proceeds of the benefice are simply an interest on his own investment, he so *pays himself* for such services as he renders to the parish; and the property, once solemnly dedicated to God for this purpose, reverts from the Church to the pocket of the patron and representative of the original founder, in the shape of the purchase-money of the living.

Still, it may be argued, the required services are rendered, and the Church or parish therefore practically suffers no wrong. Even if it were so, there remains something like the robbery from God denounced by the Prophet (Mal. iii. 8, 9), and, it may be, not without the attendant curse. But, in fact, the patent evil results of the system are of a very practical kind, and have an immediate bearing on the subject of this Essay. In the first place, the private-property character thus attaching to Parochial Endowments has reduced the preferment of the Clergy to a matter of private means and interest on their part, and materially limited the claims of long standing and personal merit. It has directly led to the unequal payments of the working Clergy and most of the other grievances of Curates. The endowments have come to be considered the private property of the one Incumbent, to be spent, as he pleases, upon himself, family, and friends. And this, even in cases where he takes no part whatever in the services; where one or more are paid by him to do the whole work of the parish, at the cost of a very inadequate portion of the income which was meant exclusively for the maintenance of those, one or more, who should actually do the work. Hence, in the great majority of parishes, the total inadequacy of the supply of pastoral ministrations. While in many, the population has enormously increased, and the endowment also has gone on proportionately increasing, so as still to furnish maintenance for a sufficient staff of clergy, if only equitably distributed, but the ministrations are still limited to the single Priest, who appropriates the whole income, and often grudges to resign any part of it, or sufficient for the purpose [1]; or, perhaps as often, cannot do so, because the endowment is absorbed by lay impro-

[1] Since the above was written, the writer has received a printed circular appeal to aid in Church extension at Luton, Beds, on the express ground "Because 17,000 have been added to the population of Luton during the last thirty years; and it may now be stated in round numbers at 20,000 souls." But on turning to the *Clergy List*, the income of the benefice (though only a Vicarage) will be found put down at 1350*l*., probably much under the mark. How many Parish Priests are in fact maintained out of this large income? And what has become of the great tithes? The writer himself, not long

priation[1]. From the same source springs the scandalous theory of *prizes* in the Church, by which a bait is held out, *not*, confessedly, for earnestness, zeal, energy, conscientiousness in the quiet and regular discharge of the clerical office, but, nominally, for ability, efficiency, success, popularity, and, really, for covetousness, ambition, unscrupulousness, forwardness, pushing, worldly scheming, and contrivance. To allure away from professional life into Holy Orders men of ability and station, under the idea of competition and reward for personal merit, and with the especial aim of worldly gain, is the ostensible and even avowed principle of the theory[2]. It is certain that no small amount of the evident restlessness and dissatisfaction, craving after preferment, and murmuring at their present lot, which are the bane and canker of the Curate's order, is traceable to the unworthy second-motive so suggested and fostered.

since, applied for the curacy, sole charge, in one of two parishes held by the same Rector, who resided in the other one. The writer pleaded for an addition of 20*l.* to the proposed stipend—100*l.* The answer was: "I could not hold out any prospect of an increase of stipend from myself, as the living of —— (where he did not reside) is but a small one." It was in fact nearly or quite 400*l.*, and, added to the income of the other parish, amounted to about 1000*l.* That is to say, that of two Priests doing precisely the same work, the one Priest (younger of the two) was to receive 900*l.*, the other 100*l.*, 300*l.* being diverted from one parish to the other to pay a Priest, who did nothing in the parish.

[1] *E. g.* The Dukes of Marlborough are owners of all the tithes of Upper Winchendon, Bucks, a parish of considerable acreage. Out of these, they pay 20*l.* per annum to the perpetual Curate, whose entire income is made up to 60*l.* by Queen Anne's Bounty and other extra sources. The Incumbent does not reside. Cobbett, in his *Legacy*, specifies numerous such cases, and shows that it led to the further abuse of *uniting parishes*, under Acts 37 Hen. VIII. 1, and 17 Chas. II. 3. [Since the above was written, it has come to the writer's knowledge that the present Duke of Marlborough proposes, at no distant date, to restore some portion of the tithes to their original appropriation.]

[2] "A year or so ago appeared an article in the *Times* upon a work which purported to describe 'the Church as a profession.' The field of Ecclesiastical labour was pourtrayed in the most glowing colours. There were so many prizes of 5000*l.* a year, so many of 1000*l.*, so many of 500*l.*, and so on. It was quietly assumed that these prizes were open to public competition; that they were rewards of merit; that every Curate might entertain a just hope of obtaining them. That pamphlet was issued by authority. I leave to the authors of it the responsibility of the extraordinary statements which were found in it. I confess that I am surprised to find that, in the face of information open to all upon the present state of Church patronage, any man of respectability could have been found bold enough to give it his sanction."—(*Church of England from a New Point of View*," p. 59.)

XI.—EQUALITY OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

A parallel or rather a correlative principle to the purpose of Parochial Endowments is the essential Equality of the Priesthood. A Priest is a Priest all the world over, equally competent to the discharge of all sacerdotal functions; entitled therefore *ex officio* to an equal share under the Divine law of provision by the Church for the maintenance of her sacred ministry. The only distinction seems to be between "those who labour in the Word and doctrine," and those who do not; *i.e.* as was said above, the actual "working clergy," who are worthy διπλῆς τιμῆς, and mere sinecurists, who have leisure to earn their livelihood by other more secular means. For there is another law of Apostolical authority, that "if any would not work, neither should he eat." Differences, of course, there must be in physical, intellectual, and spiritual capacity; and this distinction, no doubt, would reasonably and properly operate in the apportionment of their particular spheres of duty to different Priests. But for all who work with a will and with diligence, according to their several ability, there seems no reason for a difference as to the "worthiness of their hire." There is a difference, again, as the system is now practised, in the liability of Parish Priests to certain incidental charges in keeping up and working the parochial system with due efficiency, as for extra church expenses, music, singing, lighting, warming, &c., and for schools, local charities, and the like; besides, perhaps, necessary rates and assessments for secular purposes. Such difference, where it exists, ought of course in all equity to be allowed for, in the apportionment of their due maintenance to two or more Priests working together in the same parish. But not seldom these are burdens voluntarily imposed on themselves by the Clergy, often indeed from a conscientious sense of obligation so to apply a portion of their unnecessarily large benefices, but which might fairly, and more properly perhaps, be provided for by other ways and means. Simply, however, what is here meant is, that, regarding the principle of Church endowments, as above stated, where two or more Priests are, *cæteris paribus*, doing an equal share of the necessary pastoral work of the same parish, they are worthy of equal hire, and there is no reason why one should receive a larger share of the parochial emolument than the other. Until these two correlative principles be clearly recognized in theory, and adopted as a sound basis of legislation, it is well-nigh impossible that any adequate practical measure of reform in the matter can be successfully devised.

XII.—ALSO IN RELATION TO THE BISHOP.

And this essential equality of the Priesthood, it should be added, is a principle likewise applicable to the Curate's relation with his Bishop. The relationship, such as it is by Divine appointment, is one and the same throughout the whole order of the Priesthood. Whatever authority belongs *jure Divino* to a Bishop over the Priests in his diocese subject to his rule, and whatever obedience is due to him on their part by reason of this subordination, are surely distributed in equal measure to every such Priest alike, whether Curate or Incumbent. If limited or extended conventionally by human law, the relation would still remain on principle and reason alike applicable to all. It is one of the most crying and intolerable grievances of Curates, that practically this is not the case. And it is all the more important to insist on this principle just now, after the ignoble and cowardly suggestion above referred to, as thrown out to the Bishops by a beneficed Proctor of the Lower House of Convocation, and when some of the members of the Upper House appear not indisposed to arrogate to themselves a right of autocratic rule, above and independent of the Church's law, nor disinclined to use it, as suggested, for a party purpose. It cannot, then, be too strongly asserted that, by the Divine appointment, the Episcopal office is not in the nature of an absolute despotic monarchy, which can arbitrarily "lord it over GOD'S heritage;" it is rather in that of a limited and a constitutional sovereignty, subject to the common and statute law of the Church, and having no prerogative of paramount authority over matters not strictly within its jurisdiction; that 'Canonical obedience' is obedience defined by the Canon; that, in the case of English Bishops, the prescribed 'discretion' of the Ordinary is not above but under the law, and has no inherent or original power, through the grace of consecration, of 'taking order' contrary to any thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer[1]; that it operates by judicial sentence de-

[1] The point is well put in a pamphlet recently published on the Ritual question, which does not overlook the invidious position of the poor Curate:—"Let not the 'Ordinary' imagine that he is empowered to issue an edict to any Parish Priest whom he may consider 'insubordinate,' commanding him to 'put off his ribbons,' as though he were a valet, *or a mere assistant Curate*, unless it can be distinctly proved that the stole is an illegal ornament. The 'discretion of the Ordinary' does not mean his discretion. Probably it means rather that he has no discretion in the matter, and is (happily) completely bound by law and precedent" (*English Ritual and English Bishops*, Longmans, 1867). The principle was conceded by the present Bishop of Chichester so far back as 1850, in a letter to one of his Clergy, dated Nov. 26,

livered *ex cathedrâ* and subject to appeal, and not personally and domestically, by *obiter dicta* pronounced *in camerâ*, and held to be conclusive; that Parish Priests, as such, no less than Bishops, have an independent legal status, and liberty of action in matters within the proper sphere of their jurisdiction; that the often quoted maxim of S. Ignatius—*οὐδὲν ἄνευ ἐπισκόπου*—is simply a *suppressio veri*, a half truth, an abuse of quotation, when defrauded of its latter clause, no less essential to the real principle at issue—*καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτερῶν* [*Epist. ad Magnes.* N. 6][1]. That is to say, the obedience indicated is *not* that of Parish Priests in relation to their Bishop, but of the laity to the Apostolical Succession, to the Sacerdotal Order, whether resident in Priests or Bishops. *In fraudem legis facit, qui, salvis verbis legis, sententiam legis circumvenit.*

XIII.—MEASURES OF REFORM ALREADY ATTEMPTED.

Here then we have two or (disjoining the last-mentioned from the previous one) three essential conditions of modification, on which to base a legislative reform of the present anomalous and inequitable system. The object of the Essay has all along rather been to discover the true *principles* of construction than to suggest any specific measure of relief. A few words only need be added in further illustration of the latter portion of the subject. And first it may be well to consider the effect of certain practical expedients which have already been enacted in this direction.

in that year: "The *power* of a Bishop of our Church is happily not arbitrary and despotic, but *limited by law and Canon*. I desire to add, I will exert all the *influence* I possess to repress and control the practices within our Church" previously referred to. Published in the *Brighton Gazette*, Nov. 28, 1850.

[1] "As then the Lord did nothing without the Father, being of One Substance (with Him), either by Himself, or by His Apostles; so neither do ye any thing without the Bishop and the Presbyters." Other similar passages include Deacons, with Priests and Bishops. It is confessed on all hands to be a difficult matter to distinguish between the Presbyterate and Episcopate in that primitive age to which the Church of England appeals for her precedents. S. Jerome, in a well-known passage, affirms the gradual use for convenience' sake of the Episcopal rule: "With the ancients, Priests were the same as Bishops. But that the roots of dissention might be plucked up, a *use gradually arose* of committing the chief care upon one. Therefore, as the Priests know that it is by the custom of the Church that they are to be subject to him who is to be placed over them; so let the Bishops know that they are above Priests rather by custom than Divine appointment." According to the scholastic definition, they are of one and the same *order*, but differ in power and *jurisdiction*; which jurisdiction is limited by law.

1. *District Churches.*

The well-intentioned but clumsily-contrived plan of new ecclesiastical districts, cut out of over-populous parishes, under Sir Robert Peel's and other Acts, was probably directed to the sole purpose of increased 'church room,' and the extension of the parochial system, rather than to any contemplated improvement in the condition of the working Clergy. Indirectly, however, by increasing the number of freehold benefices, it so far bettered the prospect to the whole body of Curates of attaining, sooner or later, an independent and permanent incumbency. The improvement indeed, even so regarded, is infinitesimally small, and limited in application. But when we consider that the income of these District Churches is, more often than not, less than that of many 'a good (*i.e.* well-paid) Curacy,' with indefinitely large drawbacks upon it, and, if dependent on pew-rents, as is most often the case, with a serious risk of continual fluctuation and deficit in the amount, the surprising fact that no difficulty has hitherto been experienced in finding Curates ready and eager to incur the responsibilities of the position, seems plainly to prove the presumption insisted on above, that *independence* and *security of tenure*, though qualified by inadequacy of official stipend, are regarded as material compensations. And in this respect District Churches have an obvious advantage over the earlier expedient of Chapels-of-ease. They share, however, with the latter, and with Proprietary Chapels, the condemnatory stigma of being founded on the odious principle of stereotyping pew-rents. This radical flaw alone surely, so long as it remains unremedied, is more than sufficient to counterbalance any incidental benefits of the system.

2. *Spiritual Aid Societies.*

Societies, such as the Additional Curates' and Pastoral Aid, however excellent they may be for their intended purpose, simply leave the Curate's *status* exactly where it was. Indirectly, again, by increasing the demand for Assistant-Curates, they may tend to enhance in the Ecclesiastical market the value of the supply, and so perhaps raise the average rate of Curates' stipends. But the social position of the Curate, hence deriving his emolument, and his relation to the Bishop and Incumbent, are left precisely the same as in an ordinary Curacy. He is still 'a Curate, nothing more.' Nay, by his further subordination to the Society so employing him, he may be thought even to occupy

a 'lower room,' and still more keenly feel a sense of inferiority [1]. The proposal which has sometimes been made to endow permanent Curacies in populous places, leaving the Incumbent for the time being to appoint his own Curate, is less open to this objection, and might possibly be turned to further good account, as affording a method for securing better terms for the Curate, under sanction of law, in his relation to the Bishop and Incumbent. But on this head of the subject something hereafter will be added.

3. *Other Societies and Curates' Augmentation Fund.*

Eleemosynary and Mutual Aid Societies, for assisting the families of poor, infirm, and deceased Clergymen, are admirable and most charitable helps to the extent of their exceptional application, and many an anxious mind no doubt has felt reason to thank GOD for the timely assistance so rendered. But such precarious and purely gratuitous provision can scarcely be treated as forming part of the general Church system for the maintenance of her working Clergy. There is, however, one important institution, of very recent date, and not yet indeed in actual operation, which is fairly entitled to be so regarded, and may be fitly considered under this head; and that is, the Curates' Augmentation Fund, already referred to. This disclaims altogether the eleemosynary principle, and is simply an ingeniously devised plan for applying the principle of endowment to the unbeneficed Clergy. It is founded primarily on the reasonable supposition that the present average rate of Curates' stipends is inadequate to their services, and unjust, when compared with the average income of their clerical brethren who are beneficed. It proposes therefore to meet, to a certain extent, this particular grievance of the Curates. And so, no doubt, it will be pretty generally accepted by Curates themselves, and highly appreciated, as a very palpable boon, and as a material improvement on their worldly prospects. On the other hand, it must be confessed, that by no inconsiderable number both of the beneficed and unbeneficed Clergy, it is regarded with little enthusiasm, and by some with positive disfavour.

One obvious objection has been adverted to above—that it fails to act as a substitute for permanent endowment when the need of extra income begins to be most pressing. This part of the scheme, indeed, appears to betray symptoms of what, in

[1] There is the notorious case of a Curate at Cheltenham, lately discharged by the Pastoral Aid Society for contributing a hymn to the *Lyra Anglicana*.

legislation, is called 'tinkering' by different minds, intent rather on providing against possible abuses, than on fully carrying out the original principle of the measure. The plan, pure and simple, is, no doubt, suggestive of serious abuses, both on the part of needy or illiberal Incumbents, who might take the advantage of the extra 100*l.* gratuity to cut down the amount of stipend offered to their Curates, and on the part of inefficient or unscrupulous Curates, who might be content to bargain little or no stipend for little or no work, and fall back exclusively on the Augmentation Fund. Liability to abuse, it is evident, was the object mainly contemplated in certain of the provisional conditions. But then arose the apparent failure of justice involved in these conditions, which detracts so much from the beneficiary character of the undertaking, and lays it open to unfavourable criticism. This new difficulty and objection again, the Provisional Council of the Fund have endeavoured, somewhat incongruously, to solve by a further exceptional relaxation of their rule, viz.—that "should a Curate become disqualified by age, infirmity, or sickness, from discharging active duties, the Council shall have power to authorize the continuance, either wholly or in part, of his Augmentation. The Augmentation may also be temporarily continued under other special cases sanctioned by the Council" (Clause 6 of "the Constitution" of Curates' Augmentation Fund)—with what success must depend on the actual exercise of the discretion.

But the feeling of dissatisfaction goes deep below the details to the very principle of the measure. The complaint of the Curate is, that he *is* a Curate and is likely to remain so; that other Priests, younger than himself and less active in the Church's service, are continually being promoted over his head to a higher social rank of the Priesthood. But this measure, so far from offering any prospect of relief, is really based on the supposition that the present system will continue; and its effect, it is thought, must be to bolster up and perpetuate the system. "Out of about 12,870 livings, there are only 7010 of 200*l.* and upwards. To supply the vacancies for promotion which occur in these 7010 livings, the selection must be made among the following, viz., 5860 Incumbents of smaller livings, 5000 Curates, and about 4000 Clergy, who, though not engaged in parochial work, are for the most part seeking preferment. It will be seen at once that, even if Church patronage were administered solely with regard to meritorious service, the chances of a man obtaining a fair income, in early or middle life, would be much less than in any other profession. But when it is remembered that,

perhaps, the majority of those who are promoted are young men, and so hold their livings for a lifetime, and that they owe their promotion either to their having a 'family living,' or to influential friends, or to their possessing the means of purchasing preferment, it is evident that the chances of a man without interest are infinitesimally small. With such a remote probability of preferment, even after many years' service, a prudent man, without interest, must necessarily, on entering Holy Orders, contemplate the possibility of remaining a Curate all his life, and if possessed of average abilities may fairly require some guarantee that in that case he will be able to reckon upon his income increasing to at least 200*l.* a year. It is simply impossible for Incumbents to comply with this just requirement; they cannot, that is, unless assisted by the laity, comply with the law of supply and demand" (*Position and Prospects of Stipendiary Curates*, p. 7). Such is the very clear and able description of the present actual state of things, in which the promoters of the measure calmly acquiesce, and plead their case for support mainly on the strength of it. Now there are those among the Clergy, known to the writer, and he believes a very rapidly increasing number, who are indignant at what they conceive to be the intolerable iniquity of this system; who consider the sale and purchase of preferment, and the private-property principle of benefices, to weigh as a deadening curse upon the Church of England; and who utterly deny the latter premiss, in the case at least of a very considerable proportion of Incumbents, which they interpret to mean, that it is 'simply impossible' for one Priest to live upon from 300*l.* to 1000*l.* a year, while it is quite possible for another to live upon 100*l.*—and that this is the principle of Curates' stipends. It is no wonder, then, that a measure which seems based on the hypothesis of letting alone the present system, should be viewed with repugnance by many of the very class of Clergy whom primarily it is intended to benefit, but who would rather that 'the law of supply and demand' should be left to its natural course, without any such fictitious assistance, till the system utterly breaks down, as it seems fast doing, by reason of its inherent rottenness.

XIV.—OTHER REMEDIAL MEASURES AS YET UNTRIED.

His knowledge of this widespread feeling among the 'Curate' class of Clergy weighed, as much as any motive, with the writer in undertaking the present Essay. Without accepting in full this last objection to the Curates' Augmentation Fund, which he

considers likely to be the source of great worldly comfort to individual Curates, though without materially advancing the spiritual welfare of the Church in general [1], he entirely sympathizes with the ardent longing above expressed for a much more radical reform of the entire system, and would extremely regret that this partial relief should in any way prove, what it need not do, a hindrance to more effectual measures. It comes next, then, to consider briefly what these measures may be, so far as any at all are practical, and seem calculated to meet the most urgent grievances of Curates.

1. *Representation in Convocation.*

No very strong desire at the present time, probably, is felt by Curates, as a body (though the writer speaks with diffidence, and with no very extensive experience in this matter), to be enfranchised in the election of members of Convocation. How many even of the beneficed Clergy really care to give a vote for their diocesan Proctors? The truth really is, that, under the present mode of nomination and election, they practically have but the feeblest voice in the choice of their representatives. The latter are commonly the nominees of those who, by analogy of the civil Parliament, have no constitutional right to interfere in the election. Practically, they may be said to represent only pocket and rotten boroughs; and are not elected by their nominal constituency. A change in this respect, no doubt, would be a prior stage in Convocational reform. But if Convocation is ever to obtain any sufficient moral weight as the Church's Provincial Legislature, it must fairly represent all classes of the Priesthood, to which, as a whole, by Divine appointment, Church legislation is entrusted. At present, the upper and aristocratic class (*i.e.*, the dignified Clergy) alone are fully represented; and that with the largest possible infusion of the civil element. The middle-class, however (*i.e.*, the beneficed Parish Clergy) have nominally a representation. The working-class (*i.e.*, Curates, being Parish Priests) are wholly unrepresented. At present, therefore, it is only not an absolute necessity that the decrees of Convocation should be Erastian. The Upper House is wholly elected by the State; the prevailing class of the Lower House is also elected by the State, and by its nominees, the Bishops; the small remainder of elected Proctors are also

[1] The prospect of attaining to 200*l.* a year after fifteen years' service is not likely to operate as a very attractive inducement to those who enter upon Holy Orders merely as a Profession, nor is such a motive likely to advance the spirituality of the Priesthood.

mostly Bishops' nominees. It is not reasonable therefore that the smallest moral weight should be attached to the decisions of such a body, regarded as the representative legislature of the Church. It really represents the State rather than the Church; and may be so far useful as indicating the terms on which the State is willing to accept the ministrations of the Church's Clergy. This appears indeed to the writer to be the main province of the present Convocation.

2. *Limitation of the Bishop's power over Curates.*

The most intolerable grievance of the Curate, unquestionably, is his relation to the Bishop. Nothing well can be more unjust; nothing more unconstitutional. In this respect the Curate stands on a totally different ground from every other member of the Church of England. Bishops were originally appointed to 'oversee' that the Church's laws were faithfully carried out by the Priesthood subject to them in the several parishes of their respective dioceses, and to enforce the law in the case of a transgression or a shortcoming. What is said by lawyers of the *Royal*, exactly expresses the intention of the *Episcopal* supremacy. "As respects the actual law of the case regarding the royal headship," writes Mr. Gladstone, "we may gather its general principles sufficiently from the doctrine of Blackstone, who sums up the duties of the monarch to his people thus: 'To govern according to law; to execute judgment in mercy; and to *maintain* the established Religion.' And from the Coronation Oath, in which the promise is 'to *maintain* the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by the law:' and to 'preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them:' terms which imply a power somewhere to change the Ecclesiastical laws, but which describe the royal duty as generally a duty to *maintain and preserve, not to modify or innovate*" (*The State in its Relations with the Church*, chap. iv. 2).

Such was the intended duty, and such have been the constitutional status and jurisdiction of Bishops from the beginning. "Authority," says Hooker, "is a constraining power; which power were needless if we were all such as we should be, willing to do the things we ought to do without constraint. But because generally we are otherwise, we all reap singular benefit by that authority *which permits no men though they would, to slack their duty*. It does not suffice that the Lord of our household appoint

labourers what they should do, unless he set over them some chief workman *to see they do it*. Constitutions and Canons made for the ordering of Church affairs are dead taskmasters. The due execution of laws spiritual depends most upon the vigilant care of the chiefest spiritual governors, *whose charge is to see that such laws be kept by the Clergy and people under them*. With those duties which the law of GOD and the Ecclesiastical Canons require in the Clergy, lay-governors are neither for the most part so well acquainted, nor so deeply and nearly touched; requisite therefore it is, that Ecclesiastical persons have authority, *which kind of authority makes them that have it prelates*. If then it be a thing confessed, as by all good men it needs must be, to have prayers read in all churches, to have the Sacraments of GOD administered, to have the mysteries of salvation painfully taught, to have GOD every where devoutly worshipped, and all this perpetually, and with quietness, bringeth unto the whole Church, and unto every member thereof, inestimable good; how can that authority which hath been proved *the ordinance of God for the preservation of these duties in the Church*, how can it choose but deserve to be held a thing publicly most beneficial?" (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book vii. ch. xviii. 5).

This is substantially the same rationale of the Episcopal Order and Office as quoted above from S. Jerome. Happily, it is that fully embodied in the *Leges Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, as regards the power of Bishops over their Priests and people, with the solitary exception, *per incuriam*, of unfortunate Assistant-Curates. Over them, it is assumed, and unhappily it is no vain assumption, that the Bishop's *sic volo sic jubeo* is absolute and conclusive; that his *ipse dixit* in their case is sufficient law. Unhappily, too, after recent experience, it cannot be contended for a moment that such assumption is not liable to abuse. But the latest threat of its abuse above referred to, for the purpose of coercing Parish Priests to the arbitrary *dictum* of Bishops, even though in contravention of the Church's law, will, it is confidently hoped, combine both Incumbents and Curates in insisting upon justice in this matter being meted out to the latter, and their being placed on the same constitutional and legal footing as their brother-Priests. The intention of the Church itself in the matter is very evident from the provision expressly made at the first institution of the Order. Perpetual-Curates, so called, are, in the eye of the law, as distinguished from Rectors and Vicars, simply 'licensed Curates.' The Bishop's licence is their bond of tenure; but the Bishop has no more right, absolutely and *without formal judgment in Court* (that is the main point to be insisted on), to refuse or

cancel such licence, than to annul the title of the Rector or Vicar to his benefice. Until the Priesthood, as a body, be placed in this respect on the same level of even justice, this grievance must still rankle in the hearts of those who are subject to it, and more than any other single cause repel candidates from Holy Orders. *Fiat justitia ruat cœlum.*

3. *Limitation of Patronage.*

A very simple and, one would think, easily practicable measure has been suggested for enlarging the prospect of preferment, which the promoters of the Augmentation Fund appear to take for granted is limited to a favoured class: viz. those who have special interest or money at command, to obtain for themselves a living. It is that a law should be passed restricting the exercise of patronage to those who have served actively a certain number of years in Holy Orders. The length of service required for qualification would properly be regulated by the comparative numbers of clergy and benefices, so as to secure to every faithful Priest a fair chance of preferment. This would be a very great gain both to the Clergy and to the Church. It would effectually knock on the head the iniquitous and accursed system of 'young men having money' and 'entering the Church' as a *profession*, purchasing for themselves a next presentation; and strike a heavy blow at the 'private-property principle' of Church endowment. It would be no hardship to those who entered Holy Orders, "moved by the Holy Ghost," with the true motive of serving Christ in His Church, as a doorkeeper, if He so willed; while it would tend to secure experience and sobriety in the pastoral overcharge of the several parishes. And under this head may be mentioned a corresponding measure, which has already been mooted and favourably entertained in the Lower House of Convocation, providing for the retirement with pension of superannuated Incumbents. The two measures in co-operation would largely multiply the chances of preferment.

4. *Other Measures of Reform.*

And why should they not be multiplied by other measures also, to an indefinite extent? The separation of 'united parishes,' the abolition of all sinecures and pluralities of every kind (such as livings held in conjunction with Cathedral stalls and fellowships at certain Colleges), are obvious measures of the sort. In the opinion of some, by the augmentation of small livings, and the endowment of new benefices out of old Church property differently distributed, "it seems probable, when the

Ecclesiastical Commission have accomplished their work, that every clergyman of fifteen years' standing, who is fit for an independent post, may not only expect to obtain one, but to receive a fair remuneration with it" (Article in the *Times*, March 18, 1867). No doubt, this hope is extremely problematical, and even if ever realized, is founded on the supposition that the number of clergy will remain for ever at the present low rate, whereas double the number would not be too many to do the work of the Church of England efficiently in her several parishes. But why should not the same wise principle of re-distribution, conceded by Church and State in the reforms already carried on under the Ecclesiastical Commission, be applied universally to *all* Church property of every kind? What in reason or justice is there to allow the principle to take effect in the equalization of Episcopal revenues by the curtailment of some excessive endowments and the augmentation of others out of the proceeds so accruing, and to refuse it in the endeavour to restore the same approximation to equality in the payment of the Presbyterate according to their labours and honest needs? In other words, *why* should all English Bishops be placed on an equality in this respect, and not also all Priests? The principle indeed is amply conceded in its application to parochial endowments. For example, by the provision in the recent Act for the sale of Chancellor's livings, which allows an excess of income in the case of certain parishes to be applied to the augmentation of others with insufficient income. But why not apply the principle generally?

Taking the *Clergy List* as the best available authority, there is every degree of inequality in parochial endowments between the ranges of 5*l.* and 7,000*l.* (*e.g.* S. Andrew Minor, Glamorgan, and Doddington, Cambridge). This is owing mainly, of course, to the iniquity of lay-impropriation, but also to accidental causes, such as led, for instance, to the extraordinary amassment of the Finsbury Prebend. The same accidental and extraordinary causes, however, have at least equally operated in parochial endowments, enhancing some, depreciating others, and so have led to similar disproportions between the needs and incomes of different Incumbents. Why, then, should not the same equitable principle of re-adjustment be applied? It has been calculated that the average income of the beneficed clergy is 246*l.* per annum; and that out of this they pay 400,000*l.* a year for the maintenance of Assistant-Curates (*Position and Prospects*, &c. p. 6). Very well; why not convert at once the majority of these Assistant-Curates into Incumbents, with at least the same

income as they have at present? It is not meant, of course, that all parishes should be reduced to the same level of endowment, but that all Parish Priests should nearly be so. Parishes, according to their size and population, would require some a larger and some a smaller staff of clergy. The smallest and least populous require two, if the Church of England is to practise its own theory and law of daily public offices, and at least weekly celebration of Holy Communion. But take the case of a town parish (A) with a population, say five thousand, and 'worth' at present 400*l.* per annum. Then suppose another country parish elsewhere (B) with five hundred people and 700*l.* per annum. Why not raise the endowment of A to 700*l.*, dividing it into portions of 200*l.* each for three Priests and 100*l.* for a Deacon, and reduce B for this purpose to 400*l.* with portions for two Priests? The spiritual requirements of both parishes would thus be adequately supplied, and what else have we to look to in the due apportionment of Church property? The principle of 'portions' is already recognized in the Church of England; and there are a few parishes so held by two or three Incumbents to each[1]. In practice, however, the purpose of the principle is, probably in most instances, evaded by one Incumbent only residing and acting as 'Curate' for the others. The law, however, could set this right by enforcing residence and certain definite duties upon all. Thus, Curates would in fact become Portionists and Incumbents, with a legal status and an independent position within the limit of their appointed jurisdiction. And the same plan might be as readily applied to the scheme above mentioned for endowing Curacies. Endowed Lectureships[2] already exist, the Incumbents of which might be converted into Curates, retaining the same status. For all practical purposes, however, a certain priority in order might be still retained by the senior Incumbent, as regards precedence in the choice and arrangement of parochial ministrations. Or, most details might be settled by all the Clergy among themselves in council; and each would feel free to set about his own assigned and peculiar line of duty without encroaching on the proper functions of the others. There is no apparent reason at least why they should not so work harmoniously together, just as fellows of the same College, or officers of the same regiment, in fact do work. No

[1] *E.g.* Bampton, *Oxford;* Burford, *Salop;* Burnsall, *York;* Waddesdon, *Bucks;* Pontesbury, *Salop;* and there are "medieties" in Darfield, *York;* Burnham-Westgate, and Burnham-Sutton, *Norfolk.*

[2] *E.g.* At Bromyard, *Hereford,* no less than five Lecturers and one Curate are recorded on the *Clergy List.*

small portion, it must be repeated, of the present discontent and restlessness, and often despondency or levity of 'Curates' is owing to their lack of responsibility and sense of absolute subordination, added to their uncertain tenure of office. The suggestive knowledge of the easiness of getting a divorce is a strong temptation on both sides to imagine incompatibility, and to too readily parting from one another. It would be an immense gain if only to get rid of or alleviate the causes of this evil.

The experiment of the actual working power of such a system as has thus been sketched, may be said, indeed, to have been partially tried in the case of those parishes in London and elsewhere, where the Clergy live in college, and stand pretty much towards each other on a level, though with one responsible head, and each having his appointed duties. When the work is plentiful, there is not much time for jealous obstruction of one another, or intrusion into one another's departments. Each Priest probably will have his own peculiar following in the parish and congregation, but without rough rivalry, or cliquerie, or other than a wholesome emulation. There is a generous feeling cherished that there is plenty of room for all, and no ground for mutual interference. The writer does not speak without experimental knowledge on the subject. Nor can it be argued with any show of reason, though it is often imagined and asserted offhand, that the present anomalous system, with all its faults, has in past times, and does yet in actual practice, work very well as a whole. The truth is, it scarcely can be doubted, when facts come to be thoroughly looked into, that the past failures of the Church of England, and almost all its practical evils, are traceable to the one deadening curse above denounced, which gnaws as a canker into the Church's heart, and paralyzes all its vital action, and is as the abiding sin of Balaam, of Judas, of Esau, of Demas, and of Simon Magus among our Clergy, and both fosters and is fostered by our present system of parochial endowments, patronage, and preferment.

The almost entire extinction, again, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of daily worship of any kind, in every parish throughout the land; the Infidelity and Deism of the last century, the Latitudinarianism, Rationalism, and Pantheism of this, the growth of Dissent continuously since the Reformation, the alienation of the poor and working classes from the Church, our pews and their locked doors, our ruined churches, our loss of ritual, hymnody, Catholic brotherhood, communion with the faithful departed, sacramental confession, and penitential discipline; the loss, in short, of almost all that is peculiarly Christian and

best worth having in our Religion, is but the natural fruit of that legalized system of barter and traffic in sacred things, that private and family interest in the Church's property, that unequal apportionment of the Church's wealth, which is the hot-bed of covetousness, self-aggrandisement, self-indulgence, worldliness, luxury, and laziness, which has ended in spending upon self what was meant to be spent on the spiritual edification of the people, and has cut down the ordinary supply of pastoral ministrations to the measure of the lowest possible cost of money, time, and trouble. Take in proof the instance of any of our wealthy London parishes, whether in the East or West, and compare their method of working, their number of working clergy, their activity and efficiency, with the new and miserably endowed districts of the same city. Can it be pretended for a moment that what are considered the "prizes" in our Church have advanced ever so little, nay, have not rather been the principal hindrances of its growth in spirituality? And this is equally true, it is believed and feared, throughout the length and breadth of the National Church.

Is it not all but one deliberate and organized attempt to combine the worship of God and Mammon? The very notion of a 'profession' in receiving Holy Orders is a proof of our little faith, our little love, in the fulfilment of the Sacred Ministry. "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Feed My Sheep, feed My Lambs." This is the one sole, true motive that is set before us. And have we not almost universally substituted for this a habitual 'crouching,' like one of the degenerate sons of Eli, "for a piece of silver and a morsel of bread, and saying, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the Priests' offices, that I may eat a piece of bread" (1 Sam. ii. 36). This evil lies deepest of all in the essence of the Curate Question. God grant that by a wise, a timely change of system, what is scarcely possible under the temptations of the system as it exists and flourishes amongst us to the present day, the "trust in inward motion by the Holy Ghost to take upon one's self this Office and Ministration, to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people," may be the *pure* and *single* motive of our candidates for Holy Orders!

XV.—CONCLUSION.

"Try yourself by this rule!" was touchingly and impressively said in an unpublished Sermon, now in the writer's possession, at one of our best Diocesan Theological Colleges, and the words may more fitly bring this Essay to a worthy close than any of

his own .—"You want to be a Pastor of His flock. He sees your desire, and before He grants it He asks—'Lovest thou Me?' You wish to say that you do love Him. But, while you are wishing, suppose there is set before you the prospect of what that service which you seek is to be. Suppose you are to be called, not to some quiet resting-place, some 'eligible preferment,' but to a sphere of labour in the darkest places of the earth. Suppose it to be revealed to you that you are to be a Curate for all your life, on a bare maintenance, in the back slums of some crowded city, among the ignorant, vile, and outcast; or that you are to spend your strength in the distant mission-field, severed from friends, home associations, civilization—alone among the heathen, or to meet an early death among the swamps of Western Africa, or to endure hardness on the barren coasts of Labrador, or wherever else a spot can be found that has *no* comfort, *nothing* to cheer, except the Presence of JESUS in His love, and souls to be saved—would you have the heart to go on, would you still say, 'Here I am, send me? I am willing, O LORD, I am *longing* to suffer and to die for Thee?' If you really can do this, then surely you must have some love for JESUS—but if not, what are you fit for? I do not say that you are therefore to be rejected as a hireling Shepherd; it is not for me to judge, but I do say that if you want to follow the Apostles and Evangelists as they followed CHRIST, you must rise to this standard of devoted love; nothing less, nothing lower will do. And the Church at this day, if ever, wants men cast in the Apostolic mould. Look at the stagnation of the last century, and of the early days of this. The Church is suffering from it, and will suffer this long while. How is she ever to be lifted out of it? How is she ever to be the mighty lever to act upon England, England's Colonies, England's world-wide empire? Common men, respectable, gentleman-like, well-educated men, ornaments to society, these are not the sort of Clergymen to do the work—they find the Church stagnant, and they leave it so; there must be Apostolic men raised up by the mighty power of GOD—men of a single aim, men of exalted sanctity, men into whose very hearts the Cross is engraved, men who will do all, dare all, suffer all, cheerfully, rejoicingly, for CHRIST JESUS, and for the precious souls that He has bought with His Blood."

ARTHUR BAKER.

A Layman's View of Confession.

That Repentance and Confession of Sin are primary cardinal duties, obligatory by Divine law upon all mankind, is acknowledged in general terms by most professing, and even merely nominal Christians. They of the English Church hear these words, with the addition of 'Absolution,' every Sunday at least, with apparent acquiescence. But what different senses do the *Church* and the *World* attach to these expressions! How indefinite are the ideas of the greater part of Englishmen, if indeed they have formed any, on these points! How ignorant are many who accept generally the idea of that Divine Society which we denominate the Catholic Church, of their true import! And how rarely, how incompletely, how negligently, are the actions and habits which they in reality presuppose and involve, practised and adhered to!

Let us figure to ourselves an intelligent layman who has hitherto lived carelessly, perhaps irregularly, like most others of this generation, but by the providence of God has been brought to a halt in the path of life, and awakened to the importance of the grand question whether he has ever truly repented of his sins, and brought forth "worthy fruits of penance." Anxious for his spiritual welfare, and desirous of using all the means of grace, of acting up to all the precepts of the law of God in this matter, he listens to many a sermon, reads many a pious treatise, talks to his parish clergyman, and even consults some evangelical friend, and the result of their united recommendations probably amounts to this—Be sorry for your sins, confess them to God, and ask pardon for them; pray to Him for true conversion of heart and for the aid of the Holy Ghost; believe that the Blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin; confide in Him and His merits; amend your ways; but do not trust in your works—and you may be sure you will be saved. So far so good. The layman is for a time content with this information and acts upon it. But he soon begins to perceive that this is a repentance which begins and ends all in self. He discovers that it involves no act of humility, is quite consistent with spiritual pride, is a sacrifice which costs nothing, and that the so-called penitent in fact thus constitutes himself the judge of his own sins, his own confessor,

his own absolver, his own penitentiary. This cannot then, he concludes, be a complete and perfect repentance. Further: as a parent, he is earnestly anxious to promote the religious and moral renovation and welfare of his family and connexions; as a patriot, he loves his country, and beholding the present corrupt state of society, becomes earnestly desirous that it should be purified and ameliorated by bringing into operation, entire and unmutilated, every portion of the machinery which Christianity has provided for the renovation of human nature. This, he is compelled to think, has, in this age, never yet been done. He therefore determines to institute a searching inquiry into these matters for himself.

Many reasons prompt him to this course. Public discussions have taken place on Confession and Absolution, which reveal an incredible amount of ignorance and prejudice on these subjects among the people at large. Examination of statistical facts, and his own experience, have led him to the conviction that in no country in the world, professedly Christian, does such an amount of deeply seated vice, dissolution of manners, open indifference to, and even contempt of religion, coexist with so much outward acknowledgment and simulated profession of it. He is eminently practical in his views, and he wishes therefore to discover whether this corruption of manners, common it would appear to most of the northern nations of Europe, be not owing to some radical defect, some important omission in their scheme of Christianity, such as the want of an external tribunal to which the conscience should be bound to resort for correction and regulation. More especially does such a tribunal seem to him to be necessary in the case of the young, to prevent them falling into the toils of temptation, to rescue them when so entangled, to keep them in the right path when they have regained it; especially in this country, where a degree of independence of action is allowed, and an amount of immorality (under the notion of freedom) publicly tolerated, which is not permitted in any foreign state, and which seems to him utterly inconsistent, not only with the Divine law, but with the well-being of a Christian commonwealth.

In the mean time let those who impugn and vilify the ordinance of Confession, who deny that it can be any remedy for the moral ills of this world, follow up the layman's inquiry, and consider well the responsibility they have incurred. If by their denunciations and calumnies they have hardened one sinner in his profligacy, hindered one good resolve, dissuaded one Christian from going on to perfection, let them ponder whether they may not have committed the inexpiable sin which must not be prayed

for; at all events let them not charge the inquirer with arrogance, if he lay the result of his researches before the world; for they will be mainly expressed in the words of others, not his own.

I. What then in the first place is the full import, force, significancy, and extent of that word, which the New Testament writers in general use to designate the great Christian act of self-reform; (that is to say) the Greek term *Metanoia,* in three instances only *Metameleia,* which by the Latins has been uniformly rendered by the word *Penitentia* and the act by *Penitentiam agere;* and has been translated into English *Repentance, Penitence,* and *Penance?* The inquiry is of the greater importance, because Epicurean Christians who hold that—

> "Religion never was designed
> To make our pleasures less,"

insist that whereas this Greek term includes no idea of pain or punishment, none such can be required of them. A like sophism has, moreover, been made use of to overthrow the Christian Priesthood. The original Greek word is *Presbuteros,* in the Latin *Presbyter,* which expression, since the simple meaning of it is 'Elder,' it is maintained cannot include the idea of a 'Priest.' A sufficient answer to the allegation in both cases is this, that it proves far too much, and that if its validity were even partially admitted, the English language, and, indeed, all words (in all languages not simply rudimental) would become unintelligible. Thus Englishmen must not attach any idea of crime to the word *villain,* for its original meaning was only 'a farmer;' or of idolatry to the word *pagan,* for its only primary meaning is a 'villager;' or the notion of stage-playing to the word *histrionic,* for 'historia' in Greek means only a 'recital;' nor, again, may we attribute the idea of deceit to the word *hypocrite,* for literally it only signifies 'acting another man's part;' nor of 'affection' to the word *regard,* for the original is only 'to look upon stedfastly;' nor can *adoration* stand for 'worship,' for the original means only 'salutation by kissing with the hand to the mouth;' so *war* cannot belong to a 'soldier,' for that term signifies merely *a hireling,* and so on, *ad infinitum.* If such a rule be correct, it follows of necessity that from the word *Presbuteros* we must exclude all idea of an active ministry, just as much as of a Priesthood; and from the word *Metanoia* all signification of an alteration of life and action, as much as all notion of pain or punishment; for the word literally taken includes only 'change of mind.'

Arguing from Scripture itself alone this literal interpretation is utterly untenable. *Metanoia* is used (S. Luke xi. 32) to describe the severe repentance of the Ninevites. In S. Matthew xi. 21, S. Luke x. 13, "Repentance in sackcloth and ashes" is designated by the same term. *Metameleia,* which Parkhurst tells us does include a feeling of regret, is used but thrice in the New Testament (although constantly in the Septuagint, even with respect to God Himself); once (S. Matt. xxi. 29) as to the son who "repented and went;" as to Judas (S. Matt. xxviii. 3) when he hung himself; and as to the regret of S. Paul for having rebuked the Corinthians (2 Cor. vii. 8); whilst the *Metanoia* "to salvation" of the Corinthians is thus described, "carefulness, clearing of yourselves, indignation, fear, vehement desire, zeal, revenge," all inconsistent with a mere change of mind. Both these words, as Morinus (*De Penit.* lib. i. c. 2) has shown, were advisedly rendered by S. Jerome and the first Latin interpreters by the term *Penitentia,* including the idea of punishment and pain; and the Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee followed the same course. But were this not so, Sir W. Hamilton, Professor Max Müller, and grammarians in general have pointed out, and it is a familiar truth to all logicians, that the root or original of a word is but a very imperfect test for discovering its complete meaning. A certain resemblance or an agreement in one out of many forms or qualities is generally all that is indicated. Thus in Sanskrit the body itself, our frame, is called *marti,* which originally would seem to have meant *decay* or *decayed,* a *corpse* rather than a 'corpus' (Max Müller *On Language,* 2nd series, p. 319). To determine, therefore, what the sacred writers meant by *Metanoia,* from the mere etymological derivation, is as absurd as it would be by a similar method to conclude what the Sanskrit authors meant by their expression *marti.* Moreover, it is very common to describe a whole object or act by some considerable part of it; by the figure of speech called *Synecdoche,* a part is often put for the whole; as so many 'sail' means so many 'vessels,' and the ocean is called 'the deep.' But as it would be absurd to conclude from the former of these expressions that a vessel had no hull because it was called 'a sail,' and from the latter that the ocean could not be wide or salt because it was denominated 'the deep,' so is it equally absurd to argue that *Metanoia* could not include the idea of pain or punishment, or that *Presbuteros* did not mean 'Priest,' because a principal part of one consists in a change of mind, and a notable circumstance in the latter is that the original Priests were elderly men.

For it is notorious that the Greek language had no exact equivalent for what we mean by the words 'Repentance,' 'Penitence,' or 'Penance.' Hence the sacred writers adopted, to express that idea, a term which designated a principal portion and accompaniment of the act; as the translators of the Bible into Chinese have chosen, most wrongfully indeed, to use the Chinese phrase, 'King of Heaven,' to express the Eternal, Infinite Deity. In like manner, before the destruction of the Temple, there being no Greek word to designate those who were hereafter called to execute the office of Christian Priests, without usurping, before the due and convenient time, the title and office of the Priest in the still continuing Temple and its sacrifices to which Christians still conformed, or without identifying themselves with the officers of Pagan worship, the sacred writers abstained from applying even to CHRIST Himself or to the Apostles, who represented CHRIST in all His Offices (for "as My FATHER hath sent Me, so send I you"), or subsequently to the recipients of the "gift by the laying on of the Apostles' hands," the title of *Hiereus*, or any of the several expressions, *Hierophantes*, *Mystagogos*, or *Leitourgos*, which have the like force and meaning, but designated them by a circumstance or quality which was common to all, namely, that they were the older members of the Christian community. Yet were they not the less "Ambassadors of CHRIST," authorized to act in His place and "stead," "Reconcilers of men to GOD," "Stewards of the Mysteries of GOD," in succession to, and endowed with the same powers, as the Apostles themselves. It was not until the destruction of Jerusalem was imminent that our LORD Himself was designated as our great High Priest, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and the Christian body as a "Royal Priesthood" by S. Peter (1 S. Pet. ii. 9), and by S. John (Rev. i. 6; v. 10) as "a Kingdom and Priests," which, according to the majority of MSS., would seem to be the true reading.

It is a fact, therefore, that the meaning and force of the terms, *Metanoia*, *Presbuteros*, 'remitting,' 'retaining,' 'binding,' and 'loosing,' and 'Absolution,' cannot be deduced merely from their roots or etymology, or from any literal method of interpretation. What then is the right mode of arriving correctly at this true force and meaning? Before however this be settled, it will be as well first to examine the very numerous instances in which, both in the Old and New Testament, we find precepts for and examples of confession of sins to priests and prophets; of repentance, and of absolution by these priests and prophets.

Pharaoh (Exod. x. 16) confessed to Moses and Aaron almost in

the very phrases used for many ages in the Christian Church, and in consequence for the time was forgiven—"I have sinned against the LORD, and against you; now therefore forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and entreat the LORD GOD, that He may take away from me this death." In Levit. v. 5, if a man were guilty of any of the crimes there named, he was directed to confess the sin to the Priests. So (Num. v. 5)—"When a man or woman shall commit any sin, they shall confess their sins that they have done;" and by the context it appears that this confession was to be made to the Priests, who were to make an atonement for them. We read of the confession (made but too late) of Achan to Joshua, who moved him to make it (Josh. vii.); that of Saul to Samuel, also for the time accepted (1 Sam. xv. 24, 25), "I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words. Now therefore, I pray thee, *pardon my sin*, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD." That of David to Nathan may be said to be the type of the Christian practice, when in consequence of the exhortation and denunciation of the prophet (2 Sam. xii.) the royal penitent confessed to him—"I have sinned against the LORD;" and Nathan absolved him thus—"The LORD also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die:" imposing, nevertheless, the penance—"The child that is born unto thee shall surely die." So in 2 Sam. xxiv., David's confession of sin in numbering the people was indeed made to the LORD, but in the person of the prophet Gad, and a severe penance was imposed by him. Thus too Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 17—29), at the exhortation of Elijah, seems to have confessed his sin to the prophet, and done penance in sackcloth and fasting, and was, by the word of the LORD specially sent to Elijah, remitted from personal punishment in this life. Of the same nature was the "weeping sore" of Hezekiah (2 Kings xx. Isa. xxviii.), and the curing of his sickness by the word of the LORD sent by Isaiah; so too the denunciation of woe, by the same prophet, against the pride of Hezekiah confessed by him, his submission to penance, in consequence of which peace and truth were to continue in his days. So also the repentance of Manasseh; his prayerful confession to GOD seems to have been to the seers, "who spake to him words in the name of the LORD of Israel" (2 Kings xxi. 2 Chron. xxxiii.), for his prayer, and all his sins, and how he was humbled, are said to be "written in the sayings of the seers." In the story of Gehazi is related the punishment of a refusal to confess to the prophet Elisha, when moved by him to do so (2 Kings iv.). Nor was this method really altered in the New Testament. We read of the Jews who were baptized of John (the "greater Prophet") in Jordan

"confessing their sins." Thus our LORD absolved the woman taken in adultery (S. John viii.), upon her confession and humility —"Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more." In like manner the Canaanitish woman; so also Mary Magdalene— "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven her; for she loved much." Of a like sort also was the conversion and implied forgiveness of the Samaritan woman, after she had confessed her misdeeds to CHRIST (S. John iv.). Who is this that forgiveth sins? demanded the Jews. But mark the SAVIOUR'S reply— "But that ye may know that the SON of Man hath power to forgive sins; then saith He to the sick of the palsy, Arise[1]!"

As Scripture history proceeds, it is found that He who thus upon a true confession divinely forgave sins, plenarily authorized His Apostles as His delegates to do the same thing—"As My FATHER hath sent Me, so send I you" (S. John xx. 21); "He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth Me" (S. John xiii. 20); "He that heareth you heareth Me; I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me" (S. John xvii. 8); "The glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them" (*Ibid.* v. 22); "I give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19); "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (S. John xx. 23). And this is repeated *totidem verbis,* and given in the plural number to the Church in general, "Tell it to the Church" (S. Matt. xviii. 18); "Whatsoever ye" the Church "shall bind," &c. (S. Matt. xviii. 18.) "Since our LORD had the power of delegation, so by His own gift had the Apostles, of conferring the HOLY SPIRIT which He had conferred," as Bishop South says (*Sermons,* vol. iv. 25). It was not to be expected that in the subsequent part of the New Testament many examples of the remission of sins through penitence would be found. The remission, 'washing away,' of sins, and opening of the Kingdom of Heaven by the key of Baptism, would in the nascent Church be the principal feature. Moreover, those sins which required penance and absolution, would of course be rare, whilst the extraordinary gifts of the HOLY GHOST were poured forth upon the faithful. Yet Ananias and Sapphira were moved by the Apostles to confess to them their faults, and refusing to do so were struck down by a fearful judgment, and Simon Magus

[1] See a remarkable passage in Pearson *On the Creed,* p. 188.

(Acts viii. 22) at the admonition of S. Peter confessed his sin to him, beseeching him (nearly in the words of the Anglo-Saxon form presently quoted) to be an intercessor for him, that GOD's judgments should not fall on him. At Ephesus also (Acts xix. 18), "many that believed came, and confessed, and showed their deeds." And signal examples are given in the sinning Corinthian, who was by S. Paul delivered "to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the Day of the LORD JESUS" (1 Cor. v. 5); and in Hymenæus and Alexander (1 Tim. i. 20), who were excommunicated for refusing the discipline of the Church.

Arguing then from Scripture testimonies alone, the inquirer is convinced that confession to GOD only, as an instrument for and condition of the remission of his sins, is not the sole means for that purpose; but that it is his bounden duty also to confess to those whom GOD has appointed on earth as His delegates to receive that confession and to absolve those sins.

Since then etymology and literal and private interpretation are unsafe guides in ascertaining the true meaning and practical force of the terms 'Repentance,' 'Confession,' 'Absolution,' 'Priest,' and the like, the inquirer turns his attention elsewhere, and finds the elucidation of this difficulty really to depend on this question, What sense were these expressions intended and supposed to bear by those who used them? and how were they practically construed and acted on in the ages which immediately succeeded?

Now it is well known that the Canon of Holy Scripture was not formed in any respect for upwards of a hundred years after the destruction of the Temple. It was not collected into an authorized volume, as Samuel Taylor Coleridge has remarked in one of his essays, for nearly three hundred years after that event. But the Gospel had been preached to all nations, and the Christian Church constituted and ordered as a Divinely organized community long before; so that ere this Canon was so settled, as soon as ever Christianity had a literature of its own, and the power of expressing its own tenets in writing, it is found that a fixed and definite interpretation, method, and practice, had already become attached to the words *Metanoia*, *Exhomologesis*[1], *Penitentia*, *Remissio*, *Absolutio*, 'the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,' 'binding' and 'loosing,' 'remitting' and 'retaining' sins, and their respective significancy ascertained;

[1] This term is sometimes and correctly used by the Fathers to express simple Confession; sometimes by *synecdoche*, the whole penitential act.

Presbuteros and *Presbyter* had already been held synonymous with *Sacerdos* and *Hiereus*[1], and the 'another' to whom, according to S. James, Christians should 'confess' was held by common consent to be the Priest; to whom the leprosy of sin was to be shown (S. Luke xviii.). However particular churches and different ages, according to the variety of manners and times, might differ in the mode and form of the institution, this, at least, to state it in the most moderate terms, was universally recognized as a fixed rule and indubitable truth, that every baptized Christian was, as an ordinary duty, according to the precept of S. James, bound to confess his more serious sins before the Church to one or more Bishops or Priests of that Church as its officers; that such confession was considered as being made to CHRIST Himself, the Priest standing and acting in His place and stead; that exclusion from the Church and its Sacraments on earth was, since they were one and the same, exclusion from the Church in Heaven; that such power of remitting and retaining sins on earth and so in Heaven was vested in the Priests or Presbyters in the same degree and mode as in the Apostles, by the express authority and commission of CHRIST Himself; to be fully effectual on condition of true contrition in the penitent. The ingenious modern notion that this authority and commission had reference only to the preaching and explaining the Gospel, and converting sinners, had assuredly then never been broached. Even the Protestant Daillé in his *Treatise on Confession* (lib. ii. c. 9; iii. c. 25, 4), Calvin (*Instit.* lib. iii. c. 4), and Bingham (*Ecclesiast. Antiq.*), who implicitly follows Daillé, acknowledge at least as much; although all three are far more anxious to prove the Roman Church in some respects to be wrong, than to describe what the ancient primitive customs really were[2]. The words of Daillé are remarkable (lib. iii. c. 4) :—"I grant that the pastors must have heard and been acquainted in some measure with the offences of those whom they admitted to the *exhomologesis*, for otherwise they could not have determined respecting them, or legitimately or canonically imposed penances. I further willingly admit as a necessary consequence that, if any one

[1] The term *Hiereus* is several times used in the *First Epitome* of S. Clement (Edit. Dressel, Lipsiæ, 1859), e.g. p. 18, where Æneas and Lazarus are both named with that title in the Greek version.

[2] Daillé was answered by Jacques Boileau, Dean of Sens, in 1584, and by several others. The value of Daillé's work is much impaired by the fact, that he takes no notice whatever of the complete and exhaustive work of Morinus, *De Penitentia*, published not long before, with which it is strange that he should not have been acquainted.

wished to confess and do penance, he must first go to the pastors and inform them of his faults, and so must indeed have confessed to them." In another passage also (lib. iii. c. 25) he admits that private Confession and penance was "a very ancient custom." Whatever then might have been the verbal form of remission, precatory or otherwise; whatever the ceremonial acts, as the laying on of hands; whether secret sins, those of the thought, heart, mind, and will, were to be confessed privately or openly; how far penance could be imposed for sins[1], such as gluttony, pride, malice, &c., which were not openly manifest to the world, and so not noticed in the penitential codes: whether or no all sins of every kind and quality were to be confessed, before the penitent was readmitted to Christian privileges; whatever were the particular times, periodical or otherwise, for making such confessions; although, moreover, the Church might have been somewhat remiss in its rules before the Nestorian heresy appeared, which denied the validity of any repentant act for mortal sin after Baptism (the converse of the heresy of to-day which denies the necessity of outward confession and penitence for any sin), yet the principle and obligation remained always the same. It was from the beginning a prominent and most operative portion of the economy of the Church, the duty of every man, an indispensable remedial act before Communion, that every baptized Christian should confess his sins after commission to the *Presbyters, Sacerdotes, Hiereis* of the Church; they were held authorized to remit them upon certain conditions and satisfactions, as CHRIST Himself would have remitted them; to retain them as unforgiven, were such conditions and satisfactions not duly performed; and what was so rightly done upon earth by the act of the Church, was indubitably believed to be ratified in Heaven. It may be added, that it is simply incredible, as some Calvinistic writers have asserted, that sins of the thought, and heart, and desire were omitted from this confession and penitence. Our LORD Himself declares that out of the heart proceed all the most heinous crimes that man can commit, and that the indulged wish and desire to commit an offence is equivalent to the actual com-

[1] All sins were anciently ranged in three classes:—1. Mortal or capital, which occasioned trouble or scandal, such as idolatry, murder, and adultery; those guilty of them were utterly excluded from the Church until they had confessed them and done public penance, and had been restored to the Church by the Bishop. 2. Sins which although mortal, such as gluttony, pride, malice, and lust, were sometimes adjudged to public, sometimes to private confession and amends. 3. Lighter faults to be cured by prayer, almsgiving, and sorrow of heart; and the Rabbins made the same distinction.

mission, and most assuredly no ancient authorities in any way countenance this pretended exception.

Nor was this so much of a new practice or doctrine as the uninformed may suppose. Morinus (*De Penit.* lib. i. c. 8, 19) has conclusively shown, by numerous quotations from the Talmudic writers, that a somewhat similar system and very elaborate penitentiary code of great severity had been in use among the Jews since the destruction of the first Temple, when for a time, at least, the sin-offering ceased; and that this code was existing and in operation at the time of our LORD'S Advent. The phrases 'binding' and 'loosing' were, in fact, borrowed from their writings and usages; by the word 'bound' was meant ratified or determined; by the word 'loosed,' set at liberty, excused, or acquitted. Indeed, this their penitential system was even more elaborate and severe than ever was the Christian; and after the final destruction of the Temple, it was their general doctrine that sin could not be remitted except by confession to the Rabbins, with the sacrifices of sorrow of heart, good works, of love to GOD, and a strict satisfaction by performance of the penalties attached to each sin in each case. These Rabbinical books are full of the praises of David for his confession to Nathan, of Ahab and of Manasseh for their penitence. They contain rules for making this confession, and forms of excommunication, which was never taken off without the full performance of the appointed penances; as also peculiar forms of absolution, which however make it manifest that the Rabbins never assumed the forgiveness of sins in the same absolute way that our LORD did, and committed to His Church (Morinus, *De Penit.* lib. i. c. 20; ii. c. 20; iii. c. 23).

II. With these considerations before him, the inquirer proceeds to examine upon what basis of authority this very practical system of Confession, Contrition, Penance, and sacerdotal Absolution for sin is founded; for he finds it to be an undeniable historical fact that from the first throughout Christendom it formed an important and most efficient part of the Christian system; that it lasted throughout and beyond the age of martyrs, and continued to be a most effective instrument in preserving the purity and integrity of the Church, Eastern and Western, for many successive centuries, long after it had become recognized by the state.

The answer is short. The origin of and the authority for the entire Institution is Divine; the very same upon which rests our belief in the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and that is—the warrant and decree of that Divinely incorporated Society, the

column and foundation of all Truth, the then united infallible visible Catholic Church.

For on what, he reflects, must of necessity be founded his assurance of the inspired authenticity of the greater part of the New Testament? an assurance which he sees plainly must proceed from an infallible source, or be simply worthless. If it be even admitted (which cannot be done logically without similar authentication) that the mission of the Second Person of the HOLY TRINITY to man, and such of His sayings and doings as are recorded by S. Matthew and S. John who were both commissioned by Him and companied with Him on earth, be Divine; yet it is obvious that these contain but an instalment of Christian truth; and there is still wanting an authority for the inspiration of the Gospel according to S. Luke, the Acts, S. Paul's Epistles, of that to the Hebrews, and of the Revelation. That the books last mentioned are historically authentic and the production of the authors to whom they are ascribed may be satisfactorily concluded on widely different grounds; but how does it appear that any part of them are Divinely inspired?

To him who believes in Christianity as a whole, the answer is obvious—his faith is, and needs must be, purely historical. It is proved to him as matter of indubitable fact, that more than eighteen hundred years ago a Personage appeared among mankind who claimed to be the Second Person of the HOLY TRINITY, Who taught a wholly novel and peculiar system of truth, Who declared that He came by this means and by the sacrifice of Himself to save the world from eternal ruin. He referred to prophecies, and worked miracles even to raising the dead, and changing and even reversing the ordinary course of nature, to prove the truth of this declaration, and that He was GOD; and He predicted that His Gospel should spread over all the world. To accomplish this He organized a Society of which He Himself was the Head, consisting at the first of Twelve Apostles whom He, for "all power was given to Him in Heaven and in earth," expressly commissioned and sent into the world in the same manner, and with the same powers and authorities, character and office, (for, "As My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you,") as He Himself had been sent. He gave to them the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; they were to instruct the world in His doctrine and system of truth, and He emphatically promised that what they bound or loosed on earth should be bound and loosed in Heaven, and declared without qualification, that whatsoever sins they remitted were really remitted, and

whatsoever sins they retained were really so retained. They were to proclaim Gospel truth like Himself, and to authenticate it with 'signs following,' as the proofs, tests, and credentials of their Heavenly mission; and He promised that after His departure He would send them from Heaven the HOLY GHOST in His proper Person to guide them into all truth, and that He would be with them alway (which if it mean any thing must mean that these powers and authorities should remain with them) "even to the end of the world."

That this commission and power (*exousia*, delegated power, licence, authority) was not confined to the eleven individuals who personally received it, is manifest from the generality of the terms, which extend to the end of time and to the whole world; and from the fact that two persons, S. Matthias and S. Paul, were added to the College of Apostles immediately after, one of whom received more than the gifts and powers of the original eleven; that these extraordinary gifts of the HOLY GHOST (as promised) descended on thousands of their disciples; that by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles, and of those on whom they had laid hands (as *e.g.* S. Timothy), the same "gift of GOD" was communicated to others, of declaring Divine truth and of working miracles to prove it. These last—namely, the "ordained elders," together with the Apostles, constituted the first Council of Jerusalem, who were convoked and sate to declare infallible truth. In fact (as Bishop Beveridge tells us in his *Sermon on Christ's Presence with His Ministers*):—"Whatever power CHRIST had received from the FATHER, for the instruction and government of the Church, He now left the same with them, or rather with the HOLY SPIRIT, Which He breathed into them; so were they to send others by conferring the same SPIRIT upon them, and so from one to another all along, that the SPIRIT which they had now received might continue with them and their successors, and so supply His place on earth till His coming again."

The inquirer therefore perceives that it is from the consent, decree, infallible authority and warrant of this Divinely organized and continued Body, so guided into all truth alone, that as matter of cogent undeniable fact, Christians of this later age must of necessity receive and believe the inspiration of all portions of Holy Scripture. There cannot, as already observed, be by possibility any other ground; for no other of any kind exists: and if the warrant and authority of the whole be not sufficient for the purpose, much less can that of any portion, however considerable, of that Body, or of any individual member or

members of it, however wise and holy (all of them being fallible men), be enough. And the warrant and authority for this inspiration must be absolutely infallible, and without blot or mistake; for if there be a single legitimate doubt as to the validity of the authorization, the salvation of the world is imperilled, and no man can be sure that through CHRIST he can obtain salvation.

As then it is upon this sole infallible warrant and authority of the United Catholic Church of CHRIST of the three or four first centuries especially, continued during subsequent ages, that the believer receives as a fundamental of Christianity, and as beyond all doubt, the greater fact of the inspiration of all Holy Scripture; so is he bound by a necessary consequence, on the same infallible warrant and authority, to accept the minor fact, that Confession of Sins after Baptism to this Church, and so to CHRIST, in the person of His Priests or 'presbyters,' the performance of a penance if enjoined by them, and the Absolution or remission of sins given and pronounced by them (upon condition of the contrition of the penitent) in the place and stead, and with the authority, of CHRIST Himself, is a Divine Institution of universal obligation, a portion of, and necessary to, a true repentance, having an equal claim upon his acceptance and obedience with Holy Scripture itself. And there is no escape from this conclusion; for, as shall be shown, the unanimity and universality of the testimony in support of this Divine obligation is as great, or even greater, than that for the inspiration of Scripture. As S. Augustine says (lib. iv. *de Baptismo*, c. 24):—"That which the Universal Church holds, not enacted by Councils, but always retained, is most rightly believed to have been handed down from nothing less than Apostolical authority;" and as he says again (*Epist.* lib. iv. *sive* cxviii. *ad Januarium* 6):—"If the whole Church throughout the world customarily useth any thing, to dispute that it should not thus be done, is a most insolent madness." Nor otherwise, in profession at least, was Cranmer's ground of doctrine:—"I protest and openly confess that in all my doctrine, whatsoever it be, I mean and judge those things as the Catholic Church and most holy fathers of old, with one accord, have meant and judged." Ridley also, as Bishop Jewel writes:—"We are come as near as we possibly could do to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholic Bishops and Fathers; and have directed, according to their customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine, but also the Sacraments and Book of Common Prayer." And the Convocation which imposed upon the clergy subscription to the

XXXIX Articles, enjoined that preachers should preach nothing "which they wished to be retained and religiously believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from the same doctrine."

The practice and mode of exercise of this penitential system varied of course in different places and at different epochs, but that the principles upon which it was founded and the substance of the Institution always remained unchanged is certain. Thus after the outbreak of Novatianism, the orthodox Church in the third century in maintaining the efficacy of repentance even after mortal sin, instituted a very stringent course of penitential exercise before absolution could be obtained. Every penitent guilty of notorious offences was bound to go through the stages of "*fletus* (prosclausis), *auditio* (akroasis), *subjectio* (upoptosis), *consistentia* (sustasis), and participation of the sacraments (*methesis*)" (Gregor. Thaumat. *Epist.* canon ii. Concil. Carthag. canon x. 43). After a certain time secret offences, as we learn from Origen and Tertullian (and see S. Chrysostom, *Serm.* lviii. v. 772), were withdrawn from this publicity and heard by the Priests in private; for confessors became ashamed and did not confess at all, and the publication sometimes occasioned the evil in other persons. So sins of the heart and desire after a time were not openly acknowledged, in order to avoid the scandal that verbal declarations might occasion, and the surmise that by appearing as penitents such confessors had been guilty of the actual crimes themselves. (S. Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, edit. Rigault, 203; Tertull. *De Penit.* c. iv.; S. Leo, edit. Quesnel, cii. *Epist.* cxxxvi.) So the act of Confession and Penitence seems to have been practised at various seasons of the year, and to have been made at different and uncertain times, mainly, indeed, during Lent, while the Absolution was given on the Thursday before Easter; but evidence is wanting to show that it was always enforced periodically, and always of all men in all cases required as a pre-requisite to participation in the Sacrament of the Eucharist[1]. The present rule of the Roman Church dates from the year 1215, when by the 21st Cap. of the Lateran Council held in that year, it was

[1] S. Chrysostom speaks of the "great week" as the period for confessions. We find in several Monastic and provincial rules the injunction to confess three times in the year at least—viz., Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. See D'Achery Spicileg. tom. i. c. 32, an order by Chrodogangus, Bishop of Metz. So by Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans, in the 9th century. In the Anglo-Saxon Penitentials the four quarterly periods of the year are mentioned.

decreed that "every faithful person of both sexes, after he shall have arrived at years of discretion, shall alone confess all his sins faithfully, at least once in the year, to his own priest, and endeavour with all his strength to fulfil the penance enjoined upon him, and receive reverently, at the least at Easter, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, unless by the advice of his own priest or other reasonable cause it be postponed to a future time; otherwise, whilst living he shall be debarred from entering the Church, and dying shall be deprived of Christian sepulture." Thus it would seem that the Western Church intensified and stiffened that which heretofore had been, like almsgiving and the love of GOD, a privilege as well as a duty and a rule of Divine obligation which bound rather the conscience than the outward action, into a compulsory precept and penal enactment, denouncing as severe punishments on those who infringed it, as on criminals guilty of murder or sacrilege.

III. The inquirer after truth in this matter cannot of course cite a tithe of the innumerable passages to be found in the earlier Fathers which testify to the Divine institution of the Catholic system of Confession, Penitence, Priesthood and Absolution, and prove indisputably what the primitive Church understood and meant by the 'power of the keys,' the 'binding and loosing,' the 'remitting and retaining of sins,' and how universal, undoubting, and unvarying was the belief that these powers and faculties were vested in the Bishops and Priests alone, as delegates and plenipotentiaries of CHRIST Himself; but he remembers the words of S. Basil the Great (*Epist.* lx. *Ecclesiæ Antiochenæ*)—"We dare not deliver forth the offspring of our own minds, lest the words of our piety should be considered merely human, but such things as have been taught by the holy Fathers, those we give answer to all that inquire of us." He therefore desires to cite some remarkable passages from the most eminent Teachers, Confessors, and Martyrs of the undivided Church of the six first centuries; specially premising, that they are quoted not as in themselves authorities for doctrine, any more than the private opinions of other great, good, and wise men, but as irrefragable witnesses to the fact of what was the infallible voice, decree, determination, and rule of the Catholic Church in the matter[1].

[1] Grabe, the learned Oxford Editor of *S. Irenæus*, writes:—"From these passages we may gather that public penance was in use in the early Church. The method of which was this:—Having before their lawful pastor enumerated their sins, whether secret or public, then, when it was expedient for the edification of the Church, by the authority of the Priest, and with the consent

Exhortations to confess and do penance, *confiteri et penitentiam agere*, are found in the *Second Epistle* of S. Clement (Dressel's edit. 113). In that very remarkable book called the *Shepherd of Hermas* (a disciple of S. Paul mentioned in his Epistle to the Romans), which seems to have been composed by a layman in the beginning of the second century to confute the Novatian and even opposite heresies (see Dressel's *Preface*, p. xlv, and *Index*), there are many remarkable proofs of the existence of this penitential system for sins after Baptism. Thus in one passage the Pastor impersonates the Messenger of penitence, and speaks of the existence of a *Præpositus penitentiæ* (lib. iii. Similit. vii. Dressel 508) :—

"Thy house hath committed many faults and crimes, wherefore . . . they must do penance for these offences and wash themselves from the lusts of this world; when they shall have done penance, that Messenger" (subsequently called 'Pastor') "shall depart, who is *Præpositus penitentiæ*. I (says he) will ask that Messenger, who is *Præpositus penitentiæ*, to afflict you lightly, that after a short time you may be restored to your place."

In the Aramaic documents discovered by Mr. Cureton among the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, and lately published by Mr. Wright (cited by Eusebius as being preserved in the Archives of Edessa), the Apostolic succession by 'the Hand of Priesthood' is carefully deduced for all Asia and a great part of Europe :—

"If," says the Apostle Thaddeus (p. 8), "there are any who will not be persuaded by these words, let them draw near to us and disclose to us what their mind is, that, like as it were to a disease, we may apply to their minds healing medicine for the recovery of their wounds."

S. Irenæus (*Adv. Hæreses*, 62, 68, edit. Grabe) in three or four passages mentions the *Exhomologesis*, or public Confession of sins in the Church before the Priests.

of the penitent, penances, amends, satisfaction, and fruits of penance were ordered to be openly performed in the Church. Public confession was also sometimes made. As to the word *Exhomologesis*, he remarks that this expression is continually, by ecclesiastical writers, used by *Synecdoche* for *Metanoia*. With universal consent the Greek and Latin fathers expressed by this word *Exhomologesis* that confession by which a person after Baptism acknowledged himself to be guilty of many sins, not only by a general confession before God, but before those who presided over the Church, and which contained a distinct and open enumeration of each sin. This by the prescript of Christ, the usage of the Apostles, and the universal consent of the Church throughout the world, they held to be a necessary remedy for washing away offences, and a second refuge from shipwreck" (pp. 60, 62 n.).

"There is still," says Origen (*Hom.* ii. *in Levit.*),

"a seventh, and a hard and laborious remission of sins through penitence, when the sinner bathes his couch with tears, and tears are for his bread day and night, and he blushes not to tell his sin to the Priest of the LORD, and to seek for medicine; as it is said, 'I will confess my sin against myself to the LORD, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my heart.'"

"'I will confess unto the LORD my sin.' If we do this and reveal our offences, not only to GOD, but to those who can heal our wounds and sins, our sins will be blotted out by Him Who saith—'Behold, I will blot out thine iniquities as a cloud' (says Origen [*Hom.* xvii. on S. Luke]; and again in his Homily on S. Mark):—The Bishops use this saying in the same way as Peter; and having received from the SAVIOUR the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, maintain, that what is bound by them, that is, condemned, is bound also in Heaven; and what is loosed by them, is loosed also in Heaven. We must then pronounce that they speak correctly, if they have also done what Peter did, and that for which it was said to him, 'Thou art Peter.' If they are of such sort that upon them the Church is built by CHRIST, this rightly belongs to them."

"How far superior," says S. Cyprian (*De Lapsis* 203, edit. Rigault)—

"are they in faith and fear, who although not guilty of any overt act of sacrifice or false worship, and who only even thought of the same, yet confessing this thought grievingly and simply to the Priests of GOD, make a complete utter clearing (*Exhomologesis*) of the conscience, expose the burthen of their souls, and obtain a salutary remedy for their wounds, however comparatively small and light they may be. . . . Beloved brethren (he repeats), confess each of you, I entreat, his offence whilst the offender is yet in this world, whilst his confession can be received, whilst the satisfaction and remission made by the Priests is acceptable to the LORD."

The act of S. Ambrose is notorious to the world, who compelled Theodosius, the Emperor, to confess his sin, and do penance publicly for a cruel crime which he had committed, in the Cathedral at Milan, ere he admitted him to Communion. The Visigoth Wamba also performed the same penance, although not for any particular offence, but generally for his sins.

Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. vi. c. 54) relates a similar instance respecting the Emperor Philip, whom many writers consider the first Christian Emperor:—

"Philip, with his son Philip, succeeded Gordian in the Empire. He, as a Christian, wished to take part in the prayers of the Church in the last Vigil before Easter, but the Bishop of that place would not suffer him to do so until he had made his confession, and had joined himself to those who had fallen into human faults, and who were standing in the order of penitents: for since he had committed many crimes he was excluded by the Bishop until he had done this."

The Emperor is said willingly to have complied, and to have

declared his "sincere and religious affection, by these works of the fear of GOD."

Lactantius (*Institut.* iv. c. 17), three years after the Nicene Council, declares: —

"Since every conventicle of heretics call themselves especially Christians, and their Church Catholic, know that that is the true Church wherein is Confession and Penitence, and which savingly cares for the sins and wounds to which the weakness of flesh is subject."

S. Hilary (*Commentary on S. Matt.* Paris edit. 1552, p. 581, Lit. B.) writes thus:—

"To make us feel a fear by which all might be restrained, He hath set forth the immoveable sentence of Apostolic severity, that those whom they shall have bound on earth, that is, left in the chains of their sins, and those whom they shall have loosed in Confession, that is, have received to pardon for their salvation; they, under condition of the Apostolic sentence, shall be absolved or bound in Heaven."

S. Athanasius (vol. i. 990, Lit. D.) in his Homily on the words of the Gospel, "They went into the village and found a colt tied," writes:—

"If thy chains be not yet loosed, give thyself up to the disciples of CHRIST; they can save thee by that power which they have received from the SAVIOUR: 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in Heaven; and if ye shall have remitted to any their sins, they shall be remitted to them.' Every one of us is bound by the chains of sins, and so we wish that JESUS would send us His disciples to loose those chains."

S. Ephrem, Deacon of Edessa, A.D. 360 (edit. Voss. 1589, 1540 Colon. lib. i. *De Compunctione*), thus speaks:—

"And if thou shalt find thyself vanquished, haste to recover thy health; put thy heart in custody, and through Confession from thy spiritual father and physician seek the cure, that thou mayest not again suffer. So with constant care shalt thou keep thy reward and please thy LORD, and be useful to thyself."

S. Basil the Great (*Epist.* iii. *ad Amphiloch.* ii. p. 777):—

"If a man have well confessed, and he to whom by the kindness of GOD the power of binding and loosing has been committed, seeing his clean confession, diminish his penance, let him not be blamed; for Scripture history tells us that they who confess with the greatest pains shall the sooner obtain the mercy of GOD."

In his shorter rule to question 288, whether Confession is to be made to all or to certain persons only, is this reply:—

"In Confession of sin there is the same reason as in disclosing bodily diseases. As men do not tell their disease to any person at random, but to those only who have a mode of curing them, in the same way should Confession of sins

be made to those who can cure them. Necessarily must sins be opened to those to whom is committed the dispensation of the mysteries of GOD."

And he has the same reply in substance in his *Homily* (p. 345, Lit. D.).

With respect to all men in general, S. Pacian (A.D. 380) speaks thus of those who, having confessed well and opened their sins, yet know not or avoid the remedies of penance, and the acts necessary for carrying on their *exhomologesis* :—

"I entreat you, brethren, even for my sake, for that LORD Whom secrecy cannot deceive, cease from covering your wounded consciences. Prudent persons do not fear physicians, even though they have recourse to cutting or cautery. What must I a Priest do who am compelled to cure? GOD never threatens a penitent unless He pardons when penitent. Alone thou sayest GOD can do this; true enough! but what He does by His Priests is of His own Power" (*Bibliotheca Patr.* tom. i. 235, 236).

S. Gregory Nyssen (*Epist. ad Letorium,* tom. ii. p. 954) lays down :—

"He that by secret embezzlement usurps the property of others, if afterwards he shall declare and open his crime to his Priest, and study to change his sin to its contrary, shall cure his disease. (So *Ibid.* p. 369) Wherefore thou oughtest to have a greater trust in him who hath begotten thee to GOD than in those who have procreated thee bodily: boldly reveal to him what is hidden; uncover the secrets of thy soul, like hidden wounds to the physician; he will take account of thy honour and of thy health."

S. Ambrose wrote a work on Penitence against the Novatians, and his works are full of the subject—one of them is entitled *an Exhortation to Penitence,* wherein he says :—

"Not only after penance ought a man to watch inwardly against these sins, but before penance whilst he is whole; for he knows not if he will ever be able to accept penance and to confess his sins to GOD and the Priest. . . . . If thou wouldst be justified, confess thy fault, for a modest confession of sins looses the bands of crime (c. vi. and c. x.). Are ye indignant because ye see the dead revive in the Church and be raised up, having obtained pardon of their sins? Can it be that you should be afraid to ask pardon of GOD, when thou blushest not to ask it of man, or to supplicate GOD Whom thou canst not hide from, when thou art not ashamed to confess thy sins to a man who does not know thee? Such a person the Priests do not relieve from his guilt or sin who offers himself in guile and still desires to sin."

S. Chrysostom (lib. iii. *De Sacerdotio,* c. 5) declares that :—

"To those who inhabit earth and dwell on it, to them is committed the dispensation of those things which are in Heaven: to them is given a power which the great GOD hath never willed to confer either on angels or archangels, nor was it ever said to them, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven,' and 'Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in Heaven.' Earthly princes have the power of binding, but

over the body only; but that bond of the Priests, which I speak of, touches the soul, and reaches even to Heaven; so that whatever the Priest shall have accomplished below, that same GOD ratifies on high, and the LORD confirms the sentence of His servants. And what else can you say of this, but that power over all celestial things is granted them by GOD? for 'Whose soever sins,' He saith, 'ye shall have remitted are remitted to them,' and 'Whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.' What power, I adjure you, can be greater than this? . . . (Again, lib. ii. c. 4) There is nothing of all these things which a Bishop must not carefully weigh and examine, for it is only after all has been studiously and accurately inquired into, that he should at last fittingly and suitably apply the remedies. . . . (Hence again, c. 3) Therefore it is very needful that Christians, who labour under sin, should persuade themselves of their own accord to submit to the healing of the Priests, and be grateful to them for the care and medicine they supply. . . . (Again he speaks thus, *Hom.* vol. vi. 416) We do not fear Him Who is to judge us, but those who cannot trust us we dread, and fear ignominy from them; for he who blushes not to commit sins before GOD, yet blushes to disclose them to man, nor will confess or do penance, not before one or two, but before the whole world shall he be made a spectacle."

Again, S. Chrysostom says (lib. iii. *De Sacerdotio,* c. 5 and 6):—

"The FATHER hath given all judgment to the SON; but I see that all this very judgment is delivered by GOD the SON to them (i. e. the Priests), and as if translated into Heaven, and placed above human nature, and exempt from our affections, they are elevated to this princedom. . . . (Again, *Hom.* xx. in *Genesim* 4, p. 222) He who is willing, as he ought, to use the help of his conscience, to hasten to the confession of his misdeeds, to show his sore to the physician, who may cure and not aggravate it, and from him to receive remedies, to speak to him alone, no other being conscious, and diligently to speak all things, he will easily amend his sins; for the confession of sins is the abolition of our offences."

S. Jerome (vol. vii. *edit.* Erasmi, *Basle,* 1523) is equally plain:—

"If that serpent, the devil, hath secretly bitten any one and infected him unconsciously with the venom of sin, if he who is so stricken be silent and does no penance, nor will confess his wound to his brother and master, to that master who has the tongue to cure him, he will not easily recover; as a sick man ignorant of medicine who is ashamed to open his wound to the physician is not cured. . . . (So in his *Commentary on S. Matthew,* vol. ix. p. 30) As the Priest made the lepers clean or unclean, so does the Bishop and Priest bind or loose, not those simply who are innocent or guilty, but after his office; after he has heard the variety of their sins, he knows who is to be bound, who to be loosed."

Proceeding to the great S. Augustine, he is found to be equally unqualified and explicit in his doctrines and exhortations:—

"Do penance (he says, *Hom.* xlix.) such as is done in the Church of GOD, that the Church may pray for you. Let no one say, I have done it secretly,

my affair is with GOD; GOD knew it Who can pardon me, for I did it in my heart. If this be so, then without cause has it been declared, 'Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.' So without cause have the Keys been given to the Church of GOD. Shall we frustrate the Gospel of GOD? frustrate the words of CHRIST? (In his fiftieth *Homily* he says), The third action is of Penitence, which is to be undergone for those sins which the Decalogue contains, of which the Apostle says, 'They that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of GOD.' (And afterwards, *Hom.* ult. cxl.) And when the sinner shall have passed a severe medicinal sentence on himself, let him come to the Chief Pastors (*Antistites*), by whom the Keys are administered to the Church, and beginning to be a good son let him keep in order his maternal members, and receive a method of making amends from those who are set over the Sacraments, and be devout and suppliant in offering the sacrifice of a contrite heart, and so do that which not only will profit him to recover salvation, but may be an example to others. But if his sin be not only his own ill, but have grievously scandalized others, if the Priest think it useful for the Church, let him not refuse to do penance not only before many, but even the whole people. . . . (So again in his *Encheiridion*, p. 83) He who, not believing that sins are remitted in the Church, despises the Divine gift, and in this obstinacy closes his life, is guilty of the unpardonable sin against the HOLY GHOST. (So, moreover, in his twenty-seventh *Homily*, Ex. L. p. 178) Lazarus is raised up; he came forth from the tomb, he was bound; so is it with men who do penance in the confession of their sins; they have come forth from death, for they could not have confessed unless they had come forth. To confess their sin is to come forth from the hidden and the dark; and what saith the LORD to His Church? 'Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.'"

S. Leo (*Epist.* cxxxvi. *edit.* Quesnel) determines that the custom of making written confessions should be abolished:

"Since it is sufficient by secret confession to indicate to the Priests alone the wounds of conscience; for although this fulness of faith be laudable, yet since there are some sins (for all are not alike) that they may fear to publish, let this blameable custom be disused; lest many should be kept from the remedies of penitence, either through shame, or fearing that their faults should be disclosed to their enemies, and so they might be subjected to the penalties of the law. That confession is sufficient which is offered first to GOD and then to the Priest, who is as an intercessor for the faults of penitents. Then will more be provoked to penitence, if the conscience of the confessor be not published to the people."

The Council of Carthage (Ann. 419) had ordered that:—

"If the crime of any penitent was public and notorious so as to move the whole Church, hands should be laid upon him in front of the Apsis."

S. Leo further says (*Epist.* lxxxii.):—

"Great is the mercy of GOD to human frailties, that not only by the grace of Baptism, but by the medicine of penitence the hope of eternal life should be restored; that they who have violated the gift of regeneration, condemned by their own judgment, should attain remission of sins; the safe-

guards of the Divine goodness being so ordered that GOD's pardon cannot be obtained except through the supplication of the Priests. The Mediator of GOD and MAN CHRIST JESUS hath delivered this power to those who are set over the Church, that they should assign the action of penitence to persons confessing, and admit the same, when purged by a wholesome confession, by the gate of reconciliation, to the communion of the Sacraments."

S. Gregory the Great (*Hom.* xxvi. on S. John c. xx.) writes :—

"From consideration of this (of Lazarus) it is to be noticed that we ought by our pastoral authority to loose those whom we know our Creator is quickening by His awakening grace. But this quickening is known before good working, by the confession of sin. To dead Lazarus is not said 'Revive,' but 'Come forth;' for every sinner who hides his guilt within his conscience, is hidden in darkness; but although dead, the sinner comes forth, when of his own accord he confesses his iniquities. To Lazarus then it is said 'Come forth!' As if it was said aloud to some one in sins, 'Why dost thou hide thy guilt within thy conscience? Come forth now by confession, thou who now liest in darkness by refusing it.' Come forth! that is, let the sinner confess his guilt. Let the disciples when he comes forth loose his bands, that the pastors of the Church may remove from him that punishment which he deserves, if he be not ashamed to confess what he has done. . . . (And again) The causes are to be weighed, and then the power of binding and loosing to be exercised; we must discover what guilt preceded and what penance ought to follow; that such whom Almighty GOD visits with the grace of compunction, those the sentence of the pastor may absolve; then is the absolution of him who presides real, when it follows the will of the Eternal Judge. (In his *Commentary on Kings* i. 15, he further declares) :—Three things are to be considered in every true penitent—conversion of mind, confession with the mouth, and vengeance upon the sin. For what doth confession of sins profit him who is not converted in heart?"

Anastasius of Sinai, Bishop of Antioch, A.D. 599 (edit. Canisius, *Sermo de Sacra Synaxi*) writes :—

"Confess to CHRIST through His Priests thy sins; condemn thine actions, and be not ashamed. It is confusion to relate thy sin, but it is a confusion of glory and grace. Condemn thyself in the sight of men, and the Judge will justify thee before Angels and the whole world."

Venerable and saintly Bede thus comments on S. James' Epistle (c. v. p. 959, edit. Basle) :—

"'Confess therefore your sins one to another, brethren, and pray for one another that ye may be saved.' Here there ought to be this distinction, that we may confess daily and lighter offences to our co-equals, and believe that we may be helped by their daily prayers; but the uncleanness of a greater leprosy we should open according to law to the Priest, and at his discretion how and at what time he shall command, take care to be purified[1]. . . . Generally all the Church is raised in Baptism from the death of sin; and when after Bap-

[1] See a similar passage *Comm.* 1*st Epist. S. John;* Opera, Colon. edit. v. 750.

tism we again incur it, it is necessary that we revive in penitence through the same faith, and by the reconciliation of the Priests be again restored to the company of the faithful." (*Comm.* Bed. Ezra Oper. Colon. v. 368, 395.)

S. Egidius, Bishop of Noyon (*Hom.* iv. vii. *Bibliotheca Patrum*, edit. Colon. p. 258), also writes :—

"'I am with you always, even to the end of the world.' He gave to His Apostles and to us their successors the power of binding and loosing in Heaven and earth, which power of loosing the Apostle calls 'the Ministry of Reconciliation.' Therefore we act in the place of CHRIST; those whom He, absolving invisibly, judges worthy of His reconciliation, those we absolve visibly, reconciling them by the office of our ministry." "GOD (as said S. Leo) hath so ordained the benefits of His goodness, that His pardon cannot be obtained except through the supplications of His Priests; for the Mediator of GOD and man our LORD JESUS CHRIST hath delivered this power to the Prelates of His Church, that they should enjoin satisfaction and penance to those who confess, and admit such as have been purged to the Communion of the Sacraments by the medicine of reconciliation. Our SAVIOUR Himself intervenes in this work, nor ever is absent from those matters which He hath committed to His Ministers to execute."

Alcuin (*Epist.* xxvi.) declares :—

"What doth the Sacerdotal power loose if it does not consider the chains of him who is bound? the work of the physician must stop if the sick man will not show his wounds. If the wounds of the body await the hands of a carnal physician, how much more doth wounds of the soul the comforts of the spiritual physician? So by his prayers the oblation of our confession will be acceptable to GOD, and we shall receive remission from Him. . . . Must we not in Holy Baptism declare the confession of our faith, and the renunciation of Satan, and so by the ministry of the Priests, through the operation of Divine grace, be washed from all our offences? Why also in the second Baptism of Penitence, by the confession of our humility, ought we not in like manner, through the help of the Priest, to be absolved through the mercy of GOD from all sins contracted since our first Baptism?"

IV. From these select extracts, to omit innumerable others which might be cited from the great Fathers and Teachers of Christendom, it plainly appears how universal and continuing throughout the Church of the six first Centuries, and long afterwards was the user of this discipline of Confession, Penitence, and Absolution for sins after Baptism. Their rules and precepts in the seventh and eighth Centuries became embodied in elaborate Penitential Codes, which enjoined corresponding penances for almost every offence, both of flesh and spirit, act and intention; and it can scarcely be doubted that, in the disruption of society, the rapine, slaughter, and terrible crimes and excesses which accompanied and followed the breaking up of the Roman Empire,

and the irruptions of the Northern and Eastern barbarians, these Codes were main agents and instruments in preserving, keeping alive, and renewing when lost, Christian faith and morals, during a period when law, justice, and purity seemed to be utterly set at nought, or neglected by the civil power. The principal and most voluminous of them is that compiled by Theodore, who was a Greek, and Archbishop of Canterbury in the year 668 (Thorpe's *Anc. Laws and Instit. of England,* vol. ii.); and as he draws his authorities from every Christian country, it may be presumed to represent the custom at that time of the whole Christian Church. Another of these codes is that of Ecgbert, Archbishop of York, A.D. 732, which is similar in contents (*Ib.*). A third, of which several fragments remain of earlier date, is that of Columbanus the Irishman, the apostle of the Vosges and of Central France. Another is that of Cummian the Scotchman (see D'Achery's *Spicilegium*). They are all worthy of especial attention; for from them and other contemporary documents the inquirer finds it established beyond controversy, that along with Christianity was introduced into these Islands the very same system of Confession, and Penance, and of Absolution by Bishops and Priests already mentioned; and, moreover, that this Confession of particular sins to the Priest, either publicly or privately, for the purpose of obtaining absolution of the same from him, was, among the British, Irish, Scotch, and Anglo-Saxon Christians, deemed a point of Christian duty as indispensable as charity to men and prayer to GOD, and, where it might be had, a necessary adjunct to true repentance, and pre-requisite to the forgiveness of sins.

Theodore in his 41st Canon (*Ancient Laws and Instit.* ii. 48) directs:—"Let every Presbyter be careful after receiving a Confession and Penance assigned, to reconcile each person immediately, except those who are to perform public penance, who are only to be reconciled in the Supper of the LORD[1]." Even Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were to confess (*Capit.* p. 77).

[1] See the *Sarum Manual,* 1555, to that effect. The Absolution was by the Archdeacon. The rule as to public penitents "to be observed by all Christian people" was this:—On Ash-Wednesday the Bishop was to sit, and all who were guilty of capital crimes were to come and confess to him, and he was to prescribe their penance, and again on the Thursday before Easter all were to return to the same place, the Bishop was to pray over them, give them remission, and so they were to return home with the Bishop's benediction, but the Priest was diligently to inquire as to their true compunction and performance of penance, and remission was to be given accordingly.—*Ecgbert Penitent.* i. 12, vol. ii. 172.

In his extract from Ivo (*Ibid.* 85) he says:—"Some say we should confess our sins to God only; some, and that almost the entire Holy Church, to the Priests; both are practised with great profit in the Church of God." And after adding, "Confession to God only belongs to the perfect man," he continues, "We must follow the institution of the Apostle and confess our sins to each other." "One of the means" (nine are enumerated) "of obtaining remission of sins from God is, that each should confess his sins to his Confessor and reveal to him his secrets with real compunction, and then amend himself as he prescribes" (*Ecgb. Penit.* iv. 63, i. 14, *Confess.* 2). "When any one approaches his Confessor, then with the greatest fear of God and with humility he should prostrate himself before him, and ask him weeping to prescribe to him a penance for all those sins which he has committed against the will of God. Then let the Priest ask him of his faith toward God, and whether he be penitent of all his sins in act and thought. It is the time at the end of the year[1] that each man ought to address his Confessor, to begin his fast, and to confess to God and his Confessor all those matters in which he may have sinned" (*Ecgb. Pen.* iv. 65, *Confess.* 1). The laws of Alfred, Athelstan, and Edgar (quoted in Soames' *Bampt. Lect.* 287, 288) recognized the necessity of shrift for heinous offences. By the laws of Ethelred (v. 22, vi. 27) "every Christian man was to accustom himself frequently to shrift, and fearlessly to declare his sins." One time named was three days before Michaelmas for every man (*Laws of Ethelred*, viii. 2), and the Priest was visited with heavy penalties if he refused *shrift*.

The Anglo-Saxon Homilists are all precise on this point:—

"We cannot be whole unless we confess sorrowing that which we have done unrighteously. . . He that accuseth himself to his Confessor, the devil cannot accuse him at the day of judgment. . . . How can the physician heal the wounds which the sick man is ashamed of showing him? . . . Truly no man gets forgiveness of sins from God, unless he confess to some one of God's men and do satisfaction by his judgment. . . . When a man goes to his Confessor, then shall he with very great fear of God and with great humility prostrate himself before him, and pray him with weeping voice that he would teach him the satisfaction of his guiltiness, &c., and he shall confess to him his misdeeds. (Whelock's *Bede*, 341, 423, &c.) . . . So shall he who with heavy vices is leprous within, come to God's Priest to open his secret sin to the ghostly leech, and by his counsel and aid heal his soul's wounds, doing penance. Some men ween that it suffices them for a perfect cure if they confess their sins with contrite heart to God alone, and that no confession to the Priest is

[1] The year then ended March 25.

required if they cease from evil; but if their opinion were right (the Homilist then proceeds to combat it, ending) . . . . Then shall the teacher unbind him from the eternal punishment, even as the Apostles bodily loosed Lazarus." (Soames' *Bampt. Lect.* 301, from a *MS. Anglo-Saxon Homily.*)

Among the Canons enacted under King Edgar, in the middle of the tenth Century (*Ancient Laws and Institt. of England,* ii. 260), was one on Confession, thus :—

"Here beginneth the order of the Confession of S. Jerome, how a Christian ought to confess his sins. . . . When any one wishes to make Confession, let him act like a man, and blush not, accusing himself, to confess his misdeeds; for from this cometh pardon, and without confession is no pardon; confession heals, justifies, gives pardon. First let him prostrate himself with lowliness in the sight of GOD upon the earth in adoration, and with tears beseech (here follows a short Litany, that he may make a true confession). . . . Then let him begin his confession before (*coram*) GOD and before the Priest (afterwards called the spiritual leech), confessing his sins. . . . (A form of words follows, which goes into particulars very strictly: it ends thus)—For all this I pray my LORD'S forgiveness, that the Devil may never steal upon me so as to be without confession and amendment of my sins, as I to-day confess all my crimes before the LORD and SAVIOUR CHRIST, and before this holy Altar and these relics, and before my Confessor and the LORD'S Mass Priest, and am in pure and true confession, and in good will to atone for all mine offences . . . [Another form adds] Whatever the pity of GOD brings to my remembrance of evil thoughts, or impure idle words and wicked actions; whatever I have done against GOD'S commandments (*MS. Cott. Tib.* c. vi. fo. 24, Brit. Mus.), . . . and hereafter to eschew them as much as ever I can. And Thou, SAVIOUR CHRIST, be merciful and forgiving to my soul, and blot out my sins and my crimes. . . . Now I humbly pray thee, Priest of the LORD, that thou be my witness on Doomsday, that the Devil may not have power over me, and that thou be my mediator with the LORD, that I may atone for my sins and crimes, and eschew other such, so that the LORD may sustain me, Who liveth for ever and ever. Amen."

In the Ecclesiastical Institutes (*Ancient Laws and Instit.* ii. 427), probably a few years later, the directions given are much to the same effect. After particular injunctions and directions to confess and pray to GOD alone with compunction of heart privately once, twice, or oftener every day, they proceed[1] :—

"Every sin a man shall confess to his Confessor which he ever committed in word, or in work, or in thought. . . . When any one comes to his Confessor for the sake of telling him his needs and confessing his sins, then ought the Confessor earnestly to ask him concerning those things which he confesses to him, how they were done; whether intentionally or unintentionally, and whether suddenly or in a before-resolved way. The Confessor shall ask him who imparts his need to him every thing, and enjoin him to hide nothing

[1] See the Canons of the Council of Mayence, A.D. 848, and of Worms, A.D. 868, to the same effect.

from him, neither in word nor in work, of what he supposes he may have ever wrought against GOD'S will, and the Confessor shall for every thing declare the bōt (satisfaction)."

Nor was this otherwise among the British, Irish, and Scotch Churches. The ancient biographies of the Irish Saints, published by Fleming and Colgan, and the Irish Penitentials prove beyond doubt the general practice and obligatory nature of private confession among that nation in the 5th, 6th, and 7th Centuries. Columbanus, in his cænobitic rule (*Flem. Coll.* 19), declares that "confession and penance free from death," and recommended it to be practised every day before meals and at bedtime.

Similar was the rule of the religious bodies among the Anglo-Saxons and Scotch. (*Penl. Cummian. Flem. Coll.* 206, *Hom. Bedæ*, ed. Giles, lvi. lvii. lix.) Several instances are related by his biographer Adamnan, of S. Columba receiving the confession of penitents, absolving them, and enjoining penance :—

"Once he was sitting on the cliff at Hii (Iona), when he exclaimed to his attendant Diermid, 'A ship will shortly arrive from Ireland with a wise man on board, who was formerly a grievous sinner, but is now full of tearful penitence.' The vessel was seen approaching when Columba exclaimed—'Let us go and meet the disciple who hath submitted to the true penitence of CHRIST.' Fechnan, which was his name, met the Saint at the harbour weeping, and falling down on his knees at his feet, broke out into lamentations, and with groans before all present confessed his sins. The holy father weeping thus addressed him, 'Rise, my son, and be comforted; thy sins are forgiven which thou hast committed; for it is written, GOD despises not a humble and contrite heart'" (*Canis. Ant. Lect.* i. 633, 634).

So S. Molva, a contemporary of S. Gregory, was made Father Confessor (*Patrem Confessionis*) to an Irish Archbishop, who at first thought of sending over for one to S. David, in Wales (*Flem. Coll.* 376).

"This S. Molva was once travelling with one of his converts named Domnaich towards Tuam, when arriving at a Cross erected by the wayside he suddenly recollected, with grief, that he had omitted that day to confess his sins, and thus addressed his companion—'I have truly sinned to-day since I have made no confession to any Presbyter of my evil deeds; wait for me here a short time whilst I go over yonder to confess.' 'Is it then so grave a sin,' asked the convert with compunction in his heart, 'not to confess to this world? Is it not enough to pray to GOD for our sins?' S. Molva replied—'Unless a man shall have confessed his sins he shall not obtain pardon, unless GOD shall give it to him of His own grace by a great penitential punishment here on earth, or by the accusation of the devil at the judgment. As the door of a house is daily swept by a broom, so is the soul by daily confession.' And the convert hearing these words was brought faithfully to confess his sins" (*Flem. Coll.* 369; see also *Ibid.* 267, 386, 389).

The inquirer finds, moreover, that among the ancient British Christians the same system was in full operation. Gildas (himself a Briton) speaks of sins being wiped away in the humility of Confession (sect. 72). Gerennius, the Cornish prince, applied to S. Teilo in the sixth century, when passing through his country from Wales, to receive his Confession in the LORD (*Liber Landav.* 345). This Bishop was consecrated at Jerusalem (*Ibid.* 351). And numerous instances are given in this *Liber Landavensis* of confessions made, penances imposed, 'absolution,' 'pardon,' 'remission of sins' given, and penance imposed by S. Dubricius, S. David, S. Oudoceus, and others their disciples, in the sixth and following Centuries (pp. 359, 395, 414, 431, 459, 468, 515, &c., *Ibid.*).

Bede, in his *History,* relates how Adamnan, the Scotchman, "desiring to be loosed from the fetters of sin," confessed them to an Irish Priest and was enjoined penance, that "preventing the wrath of the LORD in Confession, he might find Him merciful" (lib. iv. c. 25).

V. That the Confession, Penitential course, and Absolution, in one word, the Reconciliation, even in the case of greater sins (sometimes reserved for public penitence), was frequently private and individual, is sufficiently evident from the authorities already adduced, which continually speak of single priests and single penitents. The inquirer, moreover, finds that the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries, contain *Orationes ad reconciliandum penitentem* in the singular number. The words respecting the *Exhomologesis* of Valentinus (*Irenæus,* lib. iii. c. 4) necessarily imply the same fact. S. Dionysius, in his letter to the Monk Demophilus, speaks of the confession of one person to a single Priest. The very strict regulations from the earliest times against revealing what was confessed pre-suppose it. So also does the story related by Socrates (lib. v. c. 19) of the Grand Penitentiary who was appointed specially to receive the individual confessions of those who had lapsed in the Decian persecution, and who excited a popular tumult, and was deposed, for having published the confession of a lady of high rank. Many passages of Origen and S. Chrysostom necessarily imply the same thing. As has been already remarked, the practice of private or particular confession was introduced at an early epoch in order to avoid the scandal caused by seeing persons of good reputation among the public penitents, and the fact that for this cause many declined coming to the tribunal of conscience at all.

In all these matters the rites of the Oriental and Western

Churches, as heretofore mentioned, mainly agreed. Several private and individual as well as public courses and forms of penitence of the Eastern Communion are found in Goar (*Eucholog.* p. 673, *et seq.*), and at the end of the treatise of Morinus is one ascribed to John the Faster of very early date. Even the Nestorians, a sect at one time very widely spread over Asia, have preserved the form of private and individual Reconciliation, with the usual distinction, if the crime were heinous, of a public penance (Badger's *Nestorians*, ii. 158). The Greek Church in Russia and elsewhere has also its formulary for private Confession, which is always required before Holy Communion. This last nearly resembles that of the Anglo-Saxons given by Martene (*De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* i. 275), and contains directions for a strict examination of the penitent by the Priest. Even the Confession of Augsburg (c. xi. xii.), as well as those of Saxony and Bohemia, bear the strongest testimony to the obligation of confession to man, and to the power of absolution. "Our Churches," says that of Augsburg, "teach Confession;" "that private Absolution ought to be retained in the Church, and given by the Church to repentant sinners; although the enumeration of every offence be not necessary, as being impossible." In the Comment thereon it is declared:—"Confession has not been abolished in our Churches, for no one is admitted to Communion that has not been first examined and absolved; and our teachers are careful to instruct the people that they are to consider this absolution certain and indubitable, and to receive it worthily; for it is the voice of GOD, and pronounced by His command."

In like manner it is absolutely certain, as the inquirer has already found, that in this country the Confession was from a very early period private as well as public. Forms of individual, and apparently private, reconciliation are found in the Penitential of Ecgbert, who was Archbishop of York in the eighth Century (Morinus, *De Penitent.* lib. ix. p. 699; *see App.* 11 *and* 12). Another of great eloquence and piety has been published by Martene (*De Antiq. Eccles. Rit.* i. 766), from the Pontifical of the same Ecgbert. The Durham Ritual (about A.D. 1020), published by the Surtees Society, contains a private penitential course. It is a remarkable fact, that the most complete Penitential Codes of Christendom[1] were drawn up by English Ecclesiastics; and a cursory examination will suffice to show that the complete confession of the penitent to the Priest was indispensable to their efficacy. The inference is, that in these

[1] An old Roman Code is referred to by Morinus, as well as one of Toledo, *quâ supra.*

Islands the penitential system was more completely carried out into practice than in any other portion of the Christian world. Alas, exclaims the layman, how have we departed from our traditions!

VI. To the diligent inquirer it has already become abundantly evident, that the Confession thus to be made was before and to the whole Church; and that the Absolution, or loosing from sin, and Reconciliation to this Church was, and could be, the work of Priests, or of the superior Priest the Bishop, alone. In the phrase 'the Church,' he finds was included not the Church on earth only, but that also in Heaven; "Ye are come," says S. Paul, "to the General Assembly of the Saints written in Heaven." So also that the Priests avowedly acted, from the very beginning of Christianity, as deputed by, as vicars, substitutes, legates, and plenipotentiaries of CHRIST Himself for that special purpose, by His very words and own special commission.

It is not necessary to define particularly the dignities and powers included in and signified by the titles *Hiereus, Sacerdos, Presbuteros, Presbyter,* which, as already shown, were from the first synonymous. The inquirer accepts the definition of the learned Hickes as sufficient for his purpose (*On the Priesthood,* vol. ii. 17): "He," the Priest, "is an advocate, mediator, intercessor, negotiator, representative, vicegerent, mandatory, interpellant, who by Divine institution is to officiate between GOD and man in their spiritual addresses to and negotiations with each other." He was, as amply proved, universally acknowledged by all Christians as the instrument and means whereby, as by CHRIST'S delegate, he who confessed his sins to him and through him to GOD with a truly contrite heart, was reconciled to the Church Catholic, CHRIST'S Body; and those his sins remitted in such mode as that the act done on earth was ratified in Heaven. The inquiry, therefore, by what special acts or words this benefit was conferred or certified, seems to the layman to be but of secondary importance. He finds that up to the ninth Century the formularies used for this remission or absolution were deprecatory[1], conjoined with the Imposition of hands. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Apud Euseb.* lib. iii. *Hist.* c. 23) relates how S. John the Evangelist restored a penitent youth to the Church who had relapsed into sin, telling him that he would assuredly obtain pardon for him by his prayers, and how he

[1] Thus Abimelech entreated for Abraham, and he was healed (Gen. xx.); and Job interceded for Eliphaz.

restored him to the Church again with many prayers and continual fastings. Clemens Romanus writes (lib. ii. *Constit.* c. 41 :—"You admit a Gentile who has been washed in Baptism and taught accordingly, by the Imposition of hands; and when made clean by penitence, all 'deprecating' for him, you restore him to the old pastures; and the Imposition of hands shall be to him in the place of baptism. . . . Invocation in every case is the virtue of the Imposition of hands" (lib. vii. c. 45, and S. August. lib. ii. *de Baptismo*). S. Leo, in his 92nd Epistle, and S. Augustine (Morinus, *De Penit.* 535, *Contra Donat.* lib. iii. c. 16), Tertullian and very many others mention the same Apostolic ceremony, as indeed the foregoing extracts have amply shown. As S. Pacian (*Epist. ad Sempron.* 3), quoting Tertullian, speaks :—"Let the Novatians understand that the wounded man, although he be passed by by the Priest and Levite, may still be cured by CHRIST; that the prayers of the Church are not to be denied to the humble, nor the hands of the Priests to our brethren worthy of pity."

As to the verbal form then it may be fully conceded that all the ancient Rituals, Eastern and Western, up to the eighth Century more or less, whether relating to public or private Confession and Penance[1], give a deprecatory Absolution; those of the Western Church only, from the eighth downwards, partly a deprecatory, partly a qualified indicative form; which indeed it still retains. By way of illustration three of these forms may be cited. One of them, which is ante-Gregorian (given by Morinus 696), is to be said by the Bishop or other Priest over a penitent after his Confession :—

"Be present, O LORD, with our supplications, and mercifully hear me who am the first to need Thy mercy; and grant to me, who not for any merit of mine own but of the gift of Thy grace Thou hast appointed minister of this work, faith to fulfil Thy commission; and do Thou by our ministry fulfil that which is only of Thy pity through our LORD. . . . Grant, we beseech Thee, O LORD, to this Thy servant the worthy fruit of penitence, that he may be restored to Thy holy Church, from whose integrity he hath, by sinning, fallen, by obtaining pardon for his offences through our LORD."

In the before-cited Anglo-Saxon Pontifical of Ecgbert, Archbishop of York (Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* i. 274), is the following form. After repeating the 50th Psalm, the Priest proceeds thus :—

[1] See a great number cited in the Appendix to Morinus *de Pen.*, and a reference to a very ancient Gregorian Sacramentary in the Library at Tours, p. 543.

"We absolve you in the place of the blessed Peter the Prince of the Apostles, to whom the LORD gave the power of binding and loosing, but so far as accusation pertains to you and remission pertains to us; may Almighty GOD be unto you life and salvation, and the pardoner of all your sins[1] through Him Who liveth," &c. . . . "O Holy LORD Almighty FATHER Eternal GOD, Who through JESUS CHRIST Thy SON our LORD, hath vouchsafed to cure our wounds; we Thy humble Priests entreat and beseech Thee that Thou wouldest deign to incline the ears of Thy pity to our prayers; be moved by the confession of this penitent; condone and remit all his sins and offences, and grant to this Thy servant N. pardon instead of punishment, joy for sadness, life for death, that he, who hath hope in Thy Majesty and confidence in Thy mercy, may be found worthy of the gifts of Thy peace, and may attain to Heaven and eternal life. Amen."

But although this was so, and in the Eastern Churches the words are almost entirely deprecatory to this present day, yet it is equally certain that, by the universal voice of the Church Catholic, this deprecatory prayer of the Priest *ex officio*, was held to be completely effectual for the remission of the sin of the contrite confessor; the indicative form being the declaration or announcement of the remission already complete. So the inquirer concludes that in truth there really exists no real difference whatever between the deprecatory and indicative form. Since the Priest executed an office expressly conferred upon him by CHRIST, in obedience to His command, the consequent remission followed as a matter of course. The power was indeed in earthen vessels, "that the excellency might be of GOD, not of men." But "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," was ever held to declare that the powers which CHRIST delegated to His Church and to its presidents, were to remain undiminished in potency and efficacy till He came again; "the effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man," *i.e.* of the Priest, for him who confesses his sins, will avail and be effectual for his healing to the end of the world. In settling this question, as in other cases, the inquirer looks not only at the literal expressions, but much more at what was thought, intended, and believed to be done by those that used them; and as to this point there can be no doubt whatever.

Tertullian (lib. ii. *De Pudicit.* c. 19) speaks thus:—"When thou reachest forth to the knees of the brethren, thou touchest CHRIST; CHRIST entreats the FATHER; easily is that granted which the SON demands." S. Pacian (*De Penitentia*): "He who hides not his sin from his brethren, helped by the prayers of the Church, is absolved by the prayers of CHRIST." S. Jerome

[1] This is the exact form given in the *Sarum Manual* for the Absolution of public penitents on Thursday in Holy Week.

(in *Ps.* 28) : "Daily in every one of us is the flame of lust made to cease by Confession and grace, that is, by the prayer of the Priest." S. Augustine (*Hom.* and see lib. iii. *De Baptism. Contra Donat.* c. 26) : "God dwells in His temple, that is, in His holy, faithful ones. In His Church He remits sins by those who are His living temple." S. Leo (*Epist.* 80, *ad Episcopos*) : "That Confession suffices which is first offered to God, and then to the Priest, who approaches Him as a suppliant for the sins of the penitent. Very useful and necessary is it that the guilt of our sins, before our last day, be wiped out by the prayer of the Priest" (*Epist.* 91). S. Cyprian (*Epist.* 54) :—"He appointed, Who gave the law, that what is bound on earth should be bound in Heaven; and that might be loosed there which here first should be loosed in the Church."

S. Chrysostom (lib. iii. c. 6, *De Sacerdotio*) speaks thus :—

"For the bond of the Priest touches the very soul, and reaches even to the Heavens; so that whatever Priests shall have accomplished on earth, that God ratifies on high, and the Lord confirms the sentence of His servants. . . The throne of the Priest is set in Heaven, and the administration of Heavenly things committed to him! Who says this? The very King of Heaven; 'Whatsoever ye shall bind,' &c. What can equal this honour? Heaven receives the power of judgment from earth, for the judge sits on earth. The Lord follows His servant, and whatever he decides below that He ratifies above. (*Ibid. Hom. on Isaiah;* and see *Hom.* iv. *Epist. ad Hebræos*). . . . Through the Priests of God do we put on Christ, are buried with the Son of God, and become members of that blessed Head, Jesus Christ; by them we are not only regenerated, but the sins after this they have power to remit."

Thus, too, S. Ambrose (*De Pen.* lib. ii. c. 2) :—

"Naaman thought it impossible that water should cure his leprosy; but what was impossible, that God hath made possible by His great grace. It seems impossible that sin should be remitted by penitence; yet Christ granted this to His Apostles, and this hath been transmitted by the Apostles to the office of the Priests." And as saith S. Pacian (*Epist.* 1) :—"We do this, Christ being the Author. See whether Christ was the Author, or can do this or not!" "Why [again says S. Ambrose, *De Pen.* lib. vii. s. 37], baptize ye, if sins may not be remitted through man? For in Baptism is the remission of all sins. Where is the difference, whether through penitence, or through the laver, the Priests exert this power given unto them? One is the Mystery in both."

So that although, as Mr. Palmer says (*Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. i. p. 215, 3rd edit.) :—

"The Sacerdotal benediction of penitents was in the earliest times conveyed in the form of a prayer to God for their Absolution, and in after ages different forms were used; yet these varieties *of form* were not considered of importance. A benediction seems to have been regarded as equally valid, whether conveyed in the form of a petition or declaration; whether in the optative or

indicative mood; whether in the active or passive voice; in the first, second, or third person."

VII. It is proved, then, irrefragably, by the unanimous testimony of these venerable witnesses and authorities which have been cited, that there existed in the Church from the very beginning, not only so long as it was undivided and spoke and acted infallibly as one Body, but also, after unhappily that unity had been disturbed, in every branch and division of it, a Divinely appointed and constituted Institution, or Sacramental Ordinance, in uninterrupted practical exercise, requiring every one pretending to be a Christian to confess his post-baptismal sins before the Church to its ministers and officers, as representatives of and standing in the place and stead of CHRIST Himself, and expressly empowered and authorized by Him to receive such confession, and, under condition of true contrition and purpose of real amendment, upon performance also of a proper penance as a pledge of the reality of such contrition and amendment, to loose the sinner from, and to remit those, his sins so effectually as that they were loosed and remitted also in Heaven. The inquirer then, anxious for the complete forgiveness of his offences, and for the purification and salvation of his soul, having considered these telling facts, this weighty sanction, becomes convinced that this same Sacramental ordinance is one of the most effectual of all those means which GOD has vouchsafed to grant for obtaining from His mercy both of these priceless blessings; and that although confession of sin privately to GOD, with the deepest humility and compunction of heart and purpose of self-amendment, be also his bounden duty, yet that mere sorrow and correction of life does not alone constitute a perfect repentance; that he cannot of himself confess to himself, fix his own penance and pronounce his own Absolution, if it were only for this single reason, that he is a fallible man, and proverbially must necessarily pass a most fallible judgment in his own case; the more mistaken too, because he omits or refuses to use one of the principal means appointed by GOD for accomplishing those same purposes.

Having mastered and accepted these momentous truths, the inquirer begins to be aware how integral and important a part this penitential system, in all its various modifications, performed in the spread and operations of that Christianity which produced the noble army of Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, Saints, and Martyrs, who built up the Church, converted the nations, drew over the savage multitudes of invading barbarians to the Faith who came to destroy it, brought the British Isles

within the pale of Christendom, and spread the Gospel from the Orkneys to the centre of Africa, from Gades to Cathay. He perceives, moreover, how this Institution always introduced and accompanied the Faith, pervaded and underlaid its operations in all times and in all countries, and aided and forwarded its progress; and he cannot as a parent, as a patriot, as a member of the Anglican Church, but be most anxious to obtain the benefits of this same sacred Ordinance in his own person, for his own family, for his country.

What then is his disappointment, mortification, alarm, and dismay, when he at length realizes the unhappy fact, that the clergy of the English Church, to whom he looks for help and comfort in this matter, have for a long series of years ignored and neglected this Heaven-sent instrument for the conversion and regeneration of the world; nay, that through fear of that world, they have as a body *ex voto* and of purpose suppressed it; still more, than many of them of great repute for piety, are in the habit of stultifying their own commission and their holy Orders, by vehemently denouncing it as a superstition, and making easy the rough way to Heaven, by proclaiming that every one may be his own priest, confessor, penitentiary, and absolver! Yet, meditates the inquirer, if but a tithe of what has been advanced is true, surely it was their bounden duty, in the words of the venerable Hickes (*On the Priesthood*, i. 161),—"To take care to preserve this power in purity and force, and not to let it fall into decay and desuetude, lest God should not only call them to account for their stewardship in this world, but condemn them in the next as maladministrators of His Kingdom on earth, and traitors to the trust He had committed to them." He no longer wonders why it is that they have lost their hold on the middle and lower classes, why they make so few converts at home and abroad, and why Great Britain is in many respects the most immoral and criminal country in Europe.

Sick at heart and discouraged by this discovery, the inquirer proceeds to certify himself, whether the Church of England itself, as distinct from these degenerate clergy, can be esteemed guilty of this inexcusable suppression, disavowal, and neglect. His surprise is equalled by his indignation, when he finds that it assuredly is not so guilty, and that the blame rests with the clergy alone. True it is that the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer have lamentably curtailed those noble and touching penitential forms which so abound in and enrich the ancient Eastern and Western Liturgies. It has not repeated often enough, or with sufficient emphasis, the precepts and methods of

that "Godly discipline," which yet it devoutly wishes, at least in one particular, to see restored; but that the root and substance of the Institution is there, the impartial inquirer is soon surely convinced.

First, as to the Greek expressions, *Metanoia, Metameleia,* he notices that the Anglican Bible and Formularies have adopted the translation, 'repentance,' 'penitence,' 'penance;' words all including in them the idea of pain or punishment as belonging to the act which the Greek signifies; in contradistinction to the *resipiscentia,* or *conversio cordis,* of the Calvinists and Zwinglians. In providing and ordaining clergy, the Anglican Church, he finds also, deliberately adopted the word 'Priest' (the Anglo-Saxon *Preost*), which, at the time when the Ordination Offices were composed, and for nine centuries previously, had in England a well-known and acknowledged, fixed and definite grammatical meaning, and rejected the word 'Presbyter' or 'Elder,' which they might have used, but was capable of another construction; and that, even although this word 'Presbyter' is often employed in the Roman Offices to signify 'Priest.' In the Office for Ordering of these 'Priests,' which closely resembles in all its main points that which it superseded, the Bishop with his 'Priests' "lay their hands severally upon every one that receiveth the Order of 'Priesthood;'" and the Bishop commissions them in these solemn words (which are not found in the Form for Ordaining Deacons, nor are repeated in that for the Consecration of Bishops) "Receive the Holy Ghost for the work of a Priest in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained." The XXXVIth Article of the Church of England has moreover expressly confirmed the validity of such 'Ordering,' and declares that, "neither hath it any thing that is of itself superstitious or ungodly." Words cannot be more clear and express. The framers of that Office, if these words have any meaning, plainly adopted (and let me add, those also who now use and submit to it do now categorically and without reservation or qualification in all particulars assent to and adopt the very view set forth in these pages, backed by the authority of the whole Church of the Fathers, and of the previous English Church up to that time. Nay, it will be found, upon examination of the ancient forms of Ordination of the Western Church (for which see Martene, *De Antiquit. Eccles. Rit.* vol. ii. 40), of the former Sarum, and present Roman uses, that they are comparatively precatory and benedictional, and that the Anglican is far more express, precise, unqualified, and peremptory in the

terms which it uses, the mission which it gives, and the supernatural powers which it assumes to confer, than any other.

Moreover, the 8th Canon makes it penal to affirm or teach that this form "containeth any thing in it that is repugnant to the Word of God," and declares that he who so affirms is to be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not to be restored until he repent and publicly revoke such his wicked errors. The 113th Canon threatens heavy penalties against any minister who shall reveal to any one any crime or offence: "if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the minister for the unburthening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him." The Homily on Penance declares that, "Absolution hath the promise of the forgiveness of sins," and for this reason recommends to us not only the Confession of our sins before God and to one another, but also to the "Minister of God for ghostly counsel and Absolution."

The conclusion is irresistible, that the framers of the Reformed Order intended to vindicate to the English Clergy, and claim for them every faculty and power in its integrity, which the Clergy of the Church whilst yet unreformed possessed or claimed.

The inquirer turns next to the Exhortation before Holy Communion, where he finds that whoever is troubled with the consciousness of sin may receive from the minister (not from himself) the benefit of Absolution; that word having a fixed, known, definite signification, intelligible to all. He proceeds to the Confession (which is not of sins specifically, but only generally, of having committed manifold sins and wickedness), and he finds there an 'Absolution,' partly authoritative and indicative, partly deprecatory.

He next examines the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, which he perceives is conformable to the Anglo-Saxon use, but mainly borrowed from the old English Sarum Rite, as printed in the *Sarum Manual* (fo. xci. 1555). The latter contains much the same admonition to the sick person to accuse and condemn himself, the repetition of the Creeds, the exhortation and moving to confess his particular sins, a direction to ask the questions which are expedient; "whether he hath unjustly any property belonging to other? whether he hath unjustly hurt or damnified other?" that he may make restoration, and ask pardon if he can; and a recommendation that he should give alms liberally, and direct his executors to do so. The English Rubric (it is worth while repeating it) is thus:—

"Then shall the Minister *examine* whether he repent him of his sins, and be in charity with all the world; exhorting him to forgive from the bottom

of his heart all that have offended him; and if he hath offended any other, and where he hath done injury or wrong to any man, that he make amends to the utmost of his power; and if he hath not before disposed of his goods, let him then be admonished to make his will, and to declare his debts, what he oweth, &c., for the better discharging of his conscience; and the Minister is to exhort him to be liberal to the poor. . . . Here shall the sick person *be moved* to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession the Priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it [a condition necessarily implied in all the Sarum forms], after this sort—'Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences, and by His authority committed to me *I absolve thee from all thy sins*, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. Amen.'"

The ancient Sarum Absolution in the corresponding Office is this:—

"Then shall the Priest absolve the sick person from all his sins thus:—'Our LORD JESUS CHRIST of His great pity absolve thee; and I, by the authority of The Same our LORD and GOD JESUS CHRIST, and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by the authority committed to me, *absolve thee from all thy sins* for which thou art contrite in heart, and which thou hast orally confessed to me; and from all thy other sins which, had they occurred to thy memory, thou wouldest have freely confessed to me: and I restore thee to the Sacraments of the Church, in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. Amen.'"

That for public Penitents in Holy Week is similar:—

"The Priest with outstretched arms shall say this Absolution:—'I absolve thee in the place of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, to whom the LORD gave the power of binding and loosing, so far as the accusation pertains to you and remission to us; Almighty GOD be unto you life and salvation, and the kind forgiver of all your sins.'"

On these forms comment is almost superfluous. Here, in the English Prayer Book is the very original Absolution, as Mr. Palmer observes (*Origin. Liturg.* 226), which has been given to dying penitents in the Western Church for thirteen hundred years! Only be it remarked, that the Anglican is much the most authoritative, unlimited, and unconditional of the three. As Archbishop Wake observes:—"The Absolution is so full, that the Church of Rome could not desire to add any thing to it." Again the inquirer necessarily concludes that the framers of the Anglican Formularies intended beyond dispute to claim for, and confer upon, their ministers all the authorities and powers for the remission of sins which Priests, as he has found, possessed, not only in the ancient Church Catholic, but even in the Roman Communion in particular.

Nor in principle, he sees, can this conclusion be limited to the case of the sick. If it be true that a Christian man should live every day as if it were his last, and be prepared and watch, for he "knows not at what hour the Son of Man may come," then this private Confession, Penitence, and Absolution are as incumbent upon, and necessary for, the living as for the dying. Dr. Donne says (*Serm.* S. John v. 22):—

"To every man coming to Communion it is as serious a thing as our transmigration from this world, and we should do as much here for the settling of our conscience as upon our deathbed. We blame not, we dissuade not from private and particular Confession."

He perceives too that this pious obligation cannot be fulfilled or superseded by any general Confession. The distinction is manifest. This latter is an acknowledgment that he is sinful; the duty is, that he enumerate and confess his particular sins; by which act alone can the Scriptural precepts and examples before given, and the rules and ordinances of the Church be completely fulfilled.

Happily for the lay inquirer, there are at this day some Priests of the English Church, a remnant, who have not criminally abdicated their functions, disclaimed their own authority, denied the very commission under which they act, broken their trust, who do not entirely hide their Lord's talent in a napkin, and ignore and refuse or neglect to execute the duties and offices so solemnly committed to them; or where should he take refuge? It were well if such idle and faithless pastors, who so shut the door of Heaven in the face of their flocks, would meditate on the words of S. Ambrose (*De Penitent.* lib. i. s. 27):—

"Mark this too: he that receiveth the Holy Ghost receiveth the power of binding and loosing, for so it is written, 'Whatsoever sins ye remit they are remitted, whatsoever sins ye retain they are retained.' Wherefore he that cannot loose sin hath not the Holy Ghost. The gift of the Holy Ghost is the Priest's office, and the power of the Holy Ghost consists in the loosing and binding of sins."

Let their abettors also listen to Dean Comber, when he says:—

"Wherefore let those who despise the Priest, or who invade his office, or allow no difference between a pardon pronounced by him and an ordinary person, take heed of condemning those whom God so highly honours, and beware they entrench not upon the supreme power of the Sender in disallowing the subordinate power of those that are sent."

How much better, thinks the inquirer, that all of them should order their lives as Richard Hooker, Dr. Reynolds (who was even a Dissenter), Lady Capel, Edward Boteler, the learned and

pious Dr. Grabe (a convert from Lutheranism), the eminent layman Dodwell, Mrs. Dorothy Holmes, James the Lord Derby of 1637, Evelyn of Wootton, Bishops Sanderson, Wilson, and Bull, ordered theirs, who all of them confessed their sins habitually to their Priests, their advisers and friends, and were the lights of religion and piety in their day [1].

The inquirer's concern at this negligence and disavowal of their high and solemn duties by so large a number of the clergy, and at the practical elimination of the whole system from their scheme of Christianity, is still more excited and aggravated by the discovery of the fact that the great and learned Anglican Divines—those giants of piety and theology, upon the veracity and authority of whose writings the catholicity of the English Church, in fact, rests—have in the most explicit and unqualified language asserted and taught this Power of the Keys, the benefits and duty of the Confession of particular sins to the Priest, the discipline of Penance, and the reality of the Absolution of sins in Heaven by CHRIST and the HOLY GHOST through the act of the Priest on earth. As Bishop Beveridge declares:—"Whether we preach, pray, baptize, communicate, give absolution, or whatever we do as disposing of GOD'S Mysteries, our words, judgments, acts, and deeds are not ours, but the HOLY GHOST'S."

To make quotations in support of the fact here stated from all the authorities referred to would fill a volume, and since many of them are found in Mr. Cooke's work on the *Power of the Priesthood*, it is needless to repeat them, yet a few telling and decisive passages impress themselves particularly upon the inquirer's mind.

In 1548, Archbishop Cranmer (*Catechism*, 1548; *Tracts of Anglican Fathers*, i. p. 22) says:—

"When GOD'S Ministers give you Absolution, then you shall so esteem, as if CHRIST Himself in His own Person did speak and minister to you. . . . He hath given the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and the authority to forgive sins to the Ministers of the Church; let him that is a sinner go to one of them, let him acknowledge and confess his sin, and pray him he will give him Absolution. And when the Minister doth so, then I ought stedfastly to believe that my sins are truly forgiven me in Heaven. . . . When your sins do make you afraid and sad, then seek and desire absolution of sins from the Ministers who have received a commission and commandment from CHRIST Himself to forgive men their sins. He that doth not obey this counsel, but being either blind or proud doth despise the same, he shall not find forgiveness of sins; wherefore despise not Absolution, for it is the commandment and ordinance of GOD."

[1] See Cooke's *Power of the Priesthood*, pp. 93 and 112, Parker, 1838.

At Cranmer's death, among his papers was found an article on Penitence, corrected by him, in which 'Auricular Confession' in private to the Ministers of the Church is said to be "very useful and necessary," and it is stated "that in private Absolution the Priest has power to absolve one confessing from all his sins." Ridley spoke in like terms, and Archbishop Parker's Articles of Visitation, in 1567, treat it as an heresy to deny "that mortal or voluntary sins, committed after Baptism, be not remissible in Penance" (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, vol. iii. p. 258). Let the sixteen Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury and five hundred laymen, these "blind and proud despisers," take this advice of Cranmer's to their hearts.

Becon (*Works, Parker Society*, p. 101), who died in 1570, although Puritan in his inclinations, writes thus:—

"And when the Minister shall rehearse unto you the most sweet and comfortable words of Absolution, give earnest faith unto them, being undoubtedly persuaded that your sins at that time be assuredly forgiven you, as though GOD Himself had spoken them; according to this saying of CHRIST, 'He that heareth you heareth Me' [and he repeats the same in his treatise called the *Castle of Comfort*"].

Dr. Crakanthorp, a strong writer against the Church of Rome, in his *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (p. 565) declares:—

"Our Church both approves and teaches private Confession, whereby any one disburthens the grief of his soul for the sins he hath committed into the bosom, or if you will into the ear of the Presbyter; and also after a serious and unfeigned penitence made by him, Absolution by the Keys of the Church committed to all Presbyters. . . . We have not impiously abolished private Confession and Absolution, as you calumniously assert."

So Bishop Andrewes:—

"The order is this: that 'ye remit' standeth first, and 'are remitted' standeth second. It is S. Chrysostom's note that it beginneth on earth, and that Heaven followeth after. So that whereas in prayer and in other parts of religion it is 'as in Heaven so in earth,' here it is 'as in earth so in Heaven.' '*A terrâ judicandi principalem auctoritatem sumit Cœlum.*' For the judge sits on earth; the LORD follows His servant; and whatever judgment the servant gives here below, that judgment the LORD ratifies above."

Dr. Lewis Baily, Bishop of Bangor, 1616, in his *Practice of Piety*, of which the writer possesses the 53rd edition, printed in 1719, but which reached a 73rd edition, advises a sick person to send for

"some godly and religious Pastor, not only to pray for thee, but upon thy Confession and unfeigned repentance to absolve thee of thy sins; for CHRIST hath given him a calling, power, and authority, upon repentance, to absolve

thee from thy sins—'I will give thee the Keys, &c.' They (that is Priests) have the key of loosing, therefore the power of absolving. . . . [And after explaining that they do so, not by any power of their own but ministerially, he adds], For CHRIST from Heaven doth by them, as His ministers on earth, declare whom He remitteth and bindeth, to whom He will open the gates of Heaven, and against whom He will shut them; and therefore it is not said whose sins ye signify to be remitted, but 'whose sins ye remit.' They then do remit sins, because CHRIST by their ministry remitteth sins. . . . To them he hath committed the Ministry and work of Reconciliation, by their holy calling and ordination they have received the HOLY GHOST and the ministerial power of binding and loosing. They are sent forth of the HOLY GHOST for this work whereto He called them. . . . Others may comfort with good words, but none can absolve from sin but only those to whom CHRIST hath committed the holy ministry and words of reconciliation, and of the absolution CHRIST speaketh, 'He that heareth you heareth Me.' If any sin therefore troubleth thy conscience, confess it to GOD'S Minister; ask his counsel, and if thou dost truly repent receive his Absolution, and then doubt not *in foro conscientiæ*, that thy sins be as really forgiven on earth as if thou didst hear CHRIST Himself, *in foro judicii*, pronouncing them to be forgiven in Heaven —'He that heareth you heareth Me.'"

Downame, Bishop of Derry, in his work *On the Dignity and Duty of the Ministry* (p. 616), commenting on the dignity of Priests, says:—

"As if in plainer terms he had said, the authority of forgiving sins is Divine, which being communicated, after a sort, to ministers, in that they pronouncing the forgiveness of sins according to their Commission the sins indeed are forgiven, their authority may be said to be Divine."

Joseph Mede and Bishop Montagu are equally explicit, and even the semi-Puritan Ussher declares, in his *Answer to a Jesuit*:—

"No kind of Confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us. . . . To forgive sins is proper to GOD, and to His CHRIST; yet doth He forgive by them also, unto whom He hath given power to forgive" (quoting S. Ambrose).

Bishop Hall, too, in the year 1641, declares (*Hall's Edition*, vol. vii. 451), that

"The power of remission is given not only to the Apostles, but to all their faithful successors; to all GOD'S faithful Ministers, in relation to the sins of men. . . . Neither is this only by way of a bare verbal declaration, which might proceed from any other lips, but by way of an operative and effectual application; by virtue of that delegate and commissionary authority, which is by CHRIST entrusted with them. [In the *Balm of Gilead*, chap. ii. ss. 1 and 2] I shall then by the full commission from Him that hath power of remission, say to thee, 'Son, be of good comfort, thy sins are forgiven thee.' Think not His word formal and forceless; He that hath the keys of Hell and Death, hath not said in vain, 'Whose sins,' &c. The words of His faithful Ministers on earth are ratified in Heaven. I am, however unworthy, a messenger to thee sent from Heaven. And in the Name of that GOD Who sent me, I

do here, upon the sight of thy serious repentance, before Angels and men, declare thy soul to stand right in the court of Heaven; the invaluable ransom of thy dear SAVIOUR is laid down and accepted for thee. Thou art delivered from going down into the pit of horror and perdition."

So George Herbert, in his *Parson Comforting,* declares that

"In visiting the sick, or otherwise afflicted, he followeth the Church's counsel in persuading them to particular Confession; labouring to make them understand the great good use of this ancient and pious Ordinance, and how necessary it is in some cases."

Even the semi-Arian Chillingworth (*Sermons,* vii. p. 83) speaks of the due execution of the ancient power of the Keys which CHRIST first bestowed upon His Apostles and Church, who, he declares,

"delegated to their successors an authority of binding and loosing sins upon earth, with a promise that the proceedings in the court of Heaven should be directed and regulated by them on earth. . . . [He exhorts the reader] Go to your spiritual physician, not as to one that can speak comfortable quieting words to you, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from GOD Himself to absolve and acquit you of your sins."

So, in well-known words, Bishop Jeremy Taylor (or Duppa) :—

"Disburthen your sins, which lie heavy upon you, into the bosom of your Confessor, who not only stands between GOD and you to pray for you, but hath the Power of the Keys committed to him upon your true repentance to absolve you in CHRIST'S Name from those sins you have confessed to him. . . . [And afterwards] Having made choice of such a Confessor, you are advised plainly and sincerely to open your heart to him; you are to look upon him, as he is, a trustee from GOD, and commissioned by Him as His ministerial deputy to hear, and judge, and absolve you."

Again, Jeremy Taylor exhorts to

"confess our sins, and discover the state and condition of our souls, to such person whom we or our superiors judge fit to help us in such needs . . . [If any be sick he directs] the Curate of the parish, or his own Confessor (to be sent for) for he that is the ordinary judge ought not to be passed by in such a necessity. . . [And again] Be sure that in all things a spiritual guide take you by the hand. . . . These keys are committed to his Ministry, are to be dispensed by the Priest, and by the operation of them all, he shuts and opens Heaven's gates ministerially; and therefore S. Paul calls it the Word of Reconciliation" (*Holy Dying,* ch. v. s. 2, 4; *Golden Grove, Agenda,* 82: *Apology for Liturgy,* Eden's Edition, v. 251).

So Bishop Cosin advises his readers (*Works,* iv. 254) :—

"for better preparation for the blessed Sacrament, as occasion is, to disburthen and quiet our consciences of those sins that may grieve us, or scruples that may trouble us, to a learned and discreet Priest, and from him receive advice and the benefit of Absolution. . . . For the applying of this" (viz., the

remission of sins) "unto us there are divers means and powers established by Him in His Church, which are all conferred upon the Priest by these words—'Receive the HOLY GHOST:' of all these means working the remission of sin, the Priest being the dispenser, for that end, that men may be freed from their sins and united to GOD: therefore is this power of remitting sins, *i.e.*, of absolving penitents, conferred and given in Holy Orders."

So Dr. Isaac Barrow (vol. iv. 50, 56, 426) :—

"Priests do remit sins *dispensative* in the absolving of penitents, wherein grace is exhibited and ratified by imposition of hands. . . . GOD requires that remission should be formally dispensed. . . . Solemnly and formally imparted by the hands of GOD'S Ministers. . . . If Christian men, having fallen into sin, or failed in their duty towards GOD, do confess their fault and heartily repent thereof, when the Ministers of the Church in GOD'S Name and for CHRIST'S sake do declare the pardon of their sin, and absolve them from it, we need not doubt that their sins are really forgiven and the pardon expressed in words is effectually dispensed unto them. . . . [Again, speaking of those who have committed sins unto death and have truly repented] The Church to which the public and ordinary dispensation of GOD'S grace is committed hath sufficient warrant to receive such persons into a state of grace and reconciliation with GOD, so that we need not doubt but whose sins they shall thus remit, shall in effect, according to our SAVIOUR'S word, be remitted; whom they shall thus absolve on earth, they shall be absolved in Heaven."

"It appears to be our duty," says Dean Comber (*On the Offices*, p. 309), commenting on the passage of S. James, v. 16—

"to confess our sins not only to GOD but to man also, especially to the Elders of the Church mentioned in a former verse and meant here by 'the righteous man,' a name properly given to the Ministers of GOD (see S. Matt. x. 41; xxiii. 29). They were to confess to those who prayed over them, which was 'the Elders.' 'When a man is overtaken in a fault, he that is spiritual must restore him.' And this was so received a doctrine in the primitive times, that the confession of sins to a Priest in case of a troubled conscience was esteemed an Apostolical institution."

So Dr. Fiddes, who died in 1725, the learned author of a *Body of Divinity* (p. 592-9) :—

"Confession is under certain circumstances a duty. As the Priest is our proper spiritual guide, as he is invested with a power, upon our repentance, of remitting sins, it seems upon the whole matter the safest and most comfortable method we can take when we appear in the form of penitents to make a particular Confession of our sins to him. . . . It seems highly requisite, if not absolutely necessary, to all true penitents, where the sacerdotal Absolution may be had, that, as it is a means that GOD has appointed for the remission of sins, it ought to be had; and that he therefore who dies without thinking himself obliged to have recourse to it, or in contempt of it, is in a very dangerous state, as he refuses GOD'S pardon in His own way of applying it."

So says Dr. Hole (*Discourses on the Liturgy*, 1715, p. 129) :—

"The power of remitting or retaining sins CHRIST exercised Himself in person during His stay upon earth; but being about to ascend up to Heaven, He delegated it to His Apostles and their successors in these words:—Whose soever sins,' &c. Now this power of pardoning is annexed to some acts of religion instituted by GOD for this purpose and executed only by CHRIST'S ministers."

The inquirer finds that the apostolic Bishop Wilson insists throughout his works upon the same great truth in the most unqualified manner:—

"GOD'S Ministers (he says) are stewards of the mysteries of GOD, disposers of His merits and His graces to His elect, by whom He comforts afflicted souls, absolves the penitent, &c. I know it is with difficulty that people will believe that their eternal salvation can depend upon the ministration of a man like themselves: *but so most certainly it is;* they must receive the blessing of GOD by the hands of His own Ministers (as he afterwards speaks) in the person or place of CHRIST. . . . Under the Gospel He has given His Priests authority to judge sin, which is the leprosy of the soul. He has given them rules to judge by, with authority to pronounce their pardon if they find them qualified; for this is their commission from CHRIST'S own mouth. . . . This Absolution, if duly dispensed, will have a real effect from the promise of CHRIST."

So Bishop Horne (*Works,* vol. iii. pp. 416—424, 437—439; vol. i. pp. 426, 252):—

"The regenerate spirit of a Christian . . . when sick or wounded by sin, must be recovered and restored by godly counsel and wholesome discipline by penance and Absolution . . . by the lawfully and regularly appointed delegates and representatives of the Physician of souls."

The inquirer has indeed long ago come to the conclusion with Bishop Sparrow, in his *Sermon on Confession,* that

"He that assents to the Church of England, or believes the Scriptures, or gives credit to the ancient Fathers, cannot deny the Priest the power of remitting sins, of absolving from sins all such as patiently confess unto them; and since he can in the Name of GOD forgive us our sins, good reason we should make our Confession to him. . . . Shall we by our wilful neglect go about to make void the promise of CHRIST?"

In the face of such a *consensus* of Holy Scripture, of the Primitive and Mediæval Church, and of all the great Divines of the Anglican Communion, whose doctrine is even more full and emphatic and decisive on the subject than any of their predecessors, it fills the inquirer with a sad consternation to perceive that such a very large proportion of the clergy utterly eliminate from their teaching and practice the whole matter, and, as it seems to him, criminally violate or ignore, reject, and despise their own commission, their ordination vows, and

set aside, or evade, the obligations which they have solemnly engaged to keep. Such ignorant, idle, and unfaithful pastors never really, as he but too plainly perceives, preach "that men should repent;" who, if they teach any thing, ignorantly or wilfully misinform them that conversion need not be accompanied by Penitence, or by Confession, or by Remission, except what each individual, through the medium of his own feelings or imagination, notoriously and of necessity self-deceptive as they are, can supply to himself.

The intelligent and inquiring layman has, indeed, happily come to a widely different conclusion, and has sought for and found comfort, relief, remission of sin, and help for a better life, where the Church has directed him to look for them. But what tens of thousands, he sorrowfully reflects, are in his situation spiritually, but who, in the turmoil of life, have no such means or opportunities for learning and following this the Way and the Truth! They seek in vain in their neighbourhood, even if they wish to do so, for one clergyman fit or willing to hear their Confession, and to absolve them. They are in this respect passed over untaught, and abandoned to their fate, by those whom the Church of God hath appointed to awaken them from the sleep of sin—to be their spiritual Confessors and guides. They go on to death carelessly, and in their evil or worldly courses; remaining perhaps to the end of their days ignorant how far they are sinners, without acts of penitence, or any remedy for their disease except the quack medicines of their own deceitful emotions. He involuntarily repeats to himself the well-known lines of Milton:—

> "Last came and last did go,
> The Pilot of the Galilæan Lake;
> Two massy keys he bore of metals twain
> (The golden opes, the iron shuts amain).
> He shook his mitred locks, and stern bespake—
> Enow of such as for their bellies' sake,
> Creep, and intrude, and climb into the fold;
> Of other care they little reckoning make,
> Than how to scramble at the shearer's feast,
> And shove away the worthy bidden guest.
> Blind mouths, that scarce themselves know how to hold
> A sheephook, or have learned aught else the least
> That to the faithful herdsman's art belongs.
> What recks it then; what need they? They are sped;
> And when they list, their lean and flashy songs
> Grate on their scrannel pipes of wretched straw.
> The hungry sheep look up and are not fed;
> But swoln with wind, and the rank mist they draw,

Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread,
Besides what the grim wolf, with privy paw,
Daily devours apace, and nothing fed."

VIII. But the class to which the inquirer belongs is comparatively the least numerous. He has growing sons; and he looks around at the vast and munificent educational establishments of Great Britain, and asks whither he can send them, so as to be brought up apt scholars and fit members, not only of the realm of England, but of the Kingdom of Heaven. And he groans in spirit when he discovers, as he speedily does, that there is none where the 'Godly Discipline' is practised, so that his children may have their consciences kept pure; and be guided and directed by a spiritual father, so as to be fore-armed and preserved from the corruption that is in the world, and from the offences of youth. Nay, he finds that one eminent person whose endeavours for a better system in his rising schools and colleges have endeared him to all who have the purity of the rising generation at heart, has on this account been assailed with calumnies, and has met with the most dogged opposition; his whole method having been thwarted and depreciated by those who, if they had been true, instead of counterfeit English Churchmen, ought to have been foremost in his support. The layman remembers in his early youth, when he had committed a childish offence, how the free and unreserved acknowledgment of his guilt, his sorrow and patient submission to punishment, were the indispensable conditions of his kind parents' forgiveness. Founded in the deep-profound of human nature as such a method is, he finds it all ignored in England's schools. When eloigned from his parents' care, the youth has not, and cannot find it if he will, any spiritual guide or father to supply their places; nor is it even hinted to him or supposed by any one that such a substitute is necessary or desirable. Confession of faults is of course laughed at by his companions; and corporal or mental correction, the education of terror, is simply for this purpose useless.

Every one is aware, moreover, that in all these seminaries, there are certain evil-minded and depraved boys who are a leaven of incalculable mischief to the rest. Most of our public schools and colleges too, are situate in, or within reach of, great towns, where wickedness is ever rife and temptation is sure to be at hand; where there are hundreds who make it their business to seduce others from the path of virtue, especially at an age when the inborn propensities of the human heart to evil, and the want of reflection incident to youth, render them but too easy a

prey to corrupting influences. Nevertheless, there are literally no safeguards, no superintendence of heart or conduct, except external and compulsory rules and some oral teaching, provided, which can reach and touch their individual consciences, make them disclose their wrongful actions, bring them to repentance if they have strayed, and furnish methods whereby they may be kept from transgression in future. It is but too evident how few under such circumstances can escape a mental taint, which blurs their purity, and, perhaps, mars and warps the moral sense, disinclines them to religion and religious exercises, for they fear the rebuke which they administer, during the rest of their lives; and so on, from father to son, through successive generations. Is it not a reproach and a scandal, an intolerable calamity, that in this so-called Christian land, Christian people should not endeavour to provide more effectually against this, at present, inevitable contamination of youth? Is it not a psychological marvel that any parent should contumeliously reject, or neglect, or forbid, the very remedy which the Church has, throughout all ages, from the first, suggested and employed for the purpose? Who are to blame for this lamentable state of things? Whoever they may be, it is quite certain, if there be any truth in a Judgment to come, that they will have a heavy account to give, at which they may well tremble. "He that breaketh one of the least of these commandments and teacheth men so, shall be least in the Kingdom of Heaven." If such be the training of the child, what must be his future life? "If these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

But if it be thus with the wealthier classes, how much worse does the matter stand with the lower commercial, industrial, and pauper population, who are even more exposed to moral dangers? It has often struck the calm observer with a disagreeable surprise, that whereas in the cities and towns of this country there are vast National, British, and other schools, frequented by millions of scholars, who are there supposed to be taught the main doctrines of Christianity, the moral law, and their duties to God and their neighbours,—but without, be it well observed, any hint respecting the obligation and benefit of Confession, or of a particular and personal spiritual guide,—how it happens that when once emancipated from their schooling, in Mr. Horace Mann's words (in his *Report on Religious Worship*), "they become as utter strangers to religious ordinances as the people of a heathen country. It is sadly certain that this most important section of our countrymen is thoroughly estranged from our religious institutions in their present aspect: negative,

inert indifference prevails, the practical effects of which are much the same as infidelity." Ask a grown man of any of these classes about his faith or moral conduct: nine times out of ten he evades the question. He has from disuse already forgotten the little religion he had imbibed; the moral faculty has become impaired, if it were ever thoroughly awake. He has sunk into the morass of indifference and vice! Well may the inquirer in pain and astonishment ask, "Where is the flock that I gave thee, thy beautiful flock?" In the lower commercial and middle agricultural grades it is even worse. The schools to which they generally send their children give no real religious, certainly no Church, instruction at all. Of course, no discipline of the conscience is ever dreamt of. It seems never to strike any one that there is a class of men set apart by Divine institution to be the spiritual guardians—the Confessors, the preachers of Repentance—to whom youth ought from earliest years to resort; whose office and duty it is, by examination and admonition, to find out from themselves and correct their deviations from virtue and the true faith, and to guard them from the like in future. What must be the result of sometimes informing the young which is the right way, yet never giving them any help or guidance to remain in it?

IX. If such be, with but few exceptions, the spiritually unprotected condition of the rising population of Great Britain, what must it become in its later development? Society, both high, middle, and lower, in this country, is so constituted that by far the larger proportion of the youthful adults are, in one trade, profession, or employment, or another, agglomerated and crowded together in large towns or numerous societies, where they are exposed to and solicited by allurements and enticements to vice of every description, and consequently to utter neglect of true Christianity. To omit notice of the richer portion, who, with the ability to indulge in pleasure, are inclined to adopt careless or sceptical opinions which correspond with their conduct, yet to whom a kind and considerate Confessor might manifestly be of the utmost benefit; what, asks the inquirer, happens to the young clerk, the apprentice, the warehouseman, the railway porter, the labourer, the artisan, the manufacturer, the youths male and female of the factory or of the coal mine, cast upon their own resources and inclinations, let loose, unrestrained, except by want of ability, in the area of this wicked metropolis, or of some of our great or small provincial towns, or of some vast mining or manufacturing district? How many escape the con-

tagion, when every thing conspires to extend it? "Young Men's Christian" Societies, Prayer Meetings, Temperance Societies, and the like, may be palliations, but nothing more than palliations; for they all rest upon self; they lack Apostolicity, and a Divine rule; they avoid a Repentance that is truly such, the pain of the acknowledgment of sin to another, and the systematic help of the spiritual and absolving judge and guide external to themselves, and authorized to assist them. These are but contrivances, after all, borrowed from the world, which must therefore be ineffectual. Every person sets up to be his own physician, with so low a standard of right that it is impossible in the nature of things that they can heal or advance each other. The result is found in the irreligious tone and behaviour, the sceptical opinions, the dissolute morals, the religionless, careless, and meaningless life of the vast majority of the adults of this generation, and, alas! of those of maturer age of every grade of society also. They have never heard of Penitence. They have never, from their youth upwards, been "persuaded to particular Confession," nor has any one "laboured to make them understand the great good use of this ancient and pious ordinance, and how necessary it is[1]." "The clergy now-a-days never exhort men to confess their sins[2]." Nor have they ever heard from them the exhortation of Chillingworth[3], which, if they had heard, they might have laid it to heart:—

"In obedience to CHRIST's gracious will, and as I am warranted and even enjoined by my holy Mother, the Church of England, . . . I beseech you will not suffer that Commission, which CHRIST hath given to His Ministers, to be a vain form of words without any sense under them; to be an antiquated expired Commission of no use or validity in these days; but whensoever you find yourselves charged and oppressed, especially with such crimes as do lay waste and depopulate the conscience, that you would have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignancy of your disease, that he may be able, as the cause may require, to proportion a remedy; either to search it out with corrosives or comfort and temper it with oil. And come not to him only with such a mind as you would go to a learned man, experienced in the Scriptures, as one that can speak comfortable, quieting words to you, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from GOD Himself, to absolve and acquit you of your sins. If you shall do this, assure your souls that the understanding of man is not able to conceive that transport and excess of joy and comfort which shall accrue to that man's heart that is persuaded that he hath been made partaker of this blessing according as our SAVIOUR CHRIST hath prescribed."

---

[1] Herbert's *Country Parson*, chap. xv.

[2] Wake's *Doctrine of the Church of England*, p. 42, ed. 1688.

[3] *Sermons*, vii. p. 83.

Of all this the present generation have heard nothing from the clergy generally, except to denounce, disclaim, deny, and vilify it. What is it but the old story among the Jews (Jer. v. 30), when the state of society with them was as godless and dissolute as amongst ourselves:—"A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land: the prophets prophesy falsely, and the Priests bear rule by their means, and My people love to have it so; but what will ye do in the end thereof?"

X. Let not Englishmen deceive themselves. They are beyond all question, with perhaps the exception of the Swedes, the most immoral and criminal nation in Europe, especially in those two respects which Confession can most nearly reach—offences against the seventh and eighth commandments. It is impossible in an Essay such as this to go into a lengthened and statistical detail in proof of this assertion; but there are some ascertained facts which stand out in startling relief, which are condensed and summed up below from the *Statistical Society's Journals* for 1864-65:—

"In England and Wales, in 1864, when the population was in round numbers 20,100,000, the indictable offences amounted to 51,058, the summary convictions to 440,913—together to 491,471. So that, on the whole, 1 person in every 392 was a first-class criminal; 1 in every 45 a criminal offender in a minor degree. Taking the two classes together, 1 person in every 41 is guilty of violations of the law; and if one-half be subtracted for minors, then one grown person in every 196 is a criminal in the first degree; 1 in every 20 has violated the laws of his country. In the great towns this state of things is far worse. In Birmingham, in 1864, when the population was 296,000, the indictable offences amounted to 1,258, or 1 in every 236 persons, the offences dealt with summarily to 7,914, or 1 in every 39 persons; so that, taken altogether, 1 in about every 31 persons was a violator of the laws of his country; and again, subtracting one-half for persons under age, 1 in every 15 persons of mature age was so guilty. In Manchester it was still worse. There, in a population of 338,000, 6,623, 1 in every 51 persons was guilty of a criminal offence; 11,327, 1 in every 30, of an offence summarily punished; that is, 1 in every 19 individuals: 1 out of every 9 or 10 persons of mature age is a violator of the laws. Liverpool is equally or more corrupt. There, although the indictable offences were only as 1 to 100 of the population, 4,326, yet the offences summarily punished were 36,448, 1 to every 13; so that 1 person in every 11 is a violator of the laws, or 1 in every 5 or 6 of mature age. Leeds is bad enough, but in favourable contrast; for 1 person only in 423 is criminally indictable, and only 1 in 30 a violator of the laws. In Newcastle the proportion is 1 in every 25. Nor is the Metropolis in any degree better. The persons taken into custody in the Metropolitan Police District vary from about 1 person in every 25 to 1 in every 35 in each year, of which about one-third are for offences against property; nor does this include the convictions for false weights and measures, or for violating the excise laws by adulterating food, or for light weight in bread, of the extent of which scandalous system of cheating the world has lately heard so much. In

all this Scotland is something worse than England; and Glasgow and Paisley quite equal in criminality to the great towns of England."

Turning to foreign countries:—

"In France, according to M. Guerry's elaborate *Rapport au Roi*, in 1842 (the proportion is but little changed since), in a population numbering about 35,000,000, there were judged by the superior Courts of Assize, 6,908 criminal cases, of which 5,030 were against property; by the inferior tribunals, 207,406, of every kind; making together 214,384, of which 40,535 were against property; showing that in that country 1 person in 163 is an offender. The minor offences dealt with by their Police Courts were 302,185, making together, in the whole, 516,564. So that about 1 person in every 68 only is a violator of the laws; a proportion more than one-third better than in England. In Spain, according to the return of 1857-58 [*Statistical Society's Journal*, 1860], in a population of 15,480,000, the total number of persons *arrested* for any offence whatsoever was 34,000; showing that 1 person only in 455 is a violator of the laws. In Russia [*Statistical Society's Journal*, 1864], in a population of 60,000,000, in January, February, March, April, 1863, there were only—murder, 393; manslaughter, 129; robberies, 164; in churches, 48; and only 387 children deserted; a proportion absolutely insignificant. Whilst in Sweden, a cold country, and subject to the same influences from love of intoxicating drinks, and where is no Confession, 1 out of every 241 persons is a felonious criminal."

With regard to offences against property, from these same returns it would appear in sum,

"That in Birmingham, in 1864, there were 1,576 robberies, and 178 persons convicted of using false weights and measures, being 1 in every 169 of the population, or 1 in every 85 adults. In Manchester there were 7,242 of these criminals (more than in all Spain or Russia), 1 in every 46 of the population, or 1 in every 23 of the adults. In Liverpool there were 5,933, being about 1 in 70 of the population, 1 in 35 of the adults. The list might be indefinitely extended. In the Metropolis, the state of things is but a shade better; and the startling fact that in the past year above 800 tradesmen of South London have been detected and punished for using the 'false balance,' and 127 in Islington—a sample, as every one knows (besides adulteration of food), of what is going on in every town in the kingdom,—has revealed a fearful state of moral turpitude among that class. The latest returns would seem to show that at least 1 in 190 of the existing population of England and Wales are guilty of *detected* acts of flagrant dishonesty of various kinds, the same proportion nearly as in Saxony and in Sweden. In Ireland, according to the late returns, it is 29 per cent. less than in England, and much less than that in the southern counties. In Spain, the proportion at the outside is less than 1 in 10,000. In Cadiz, the seaport town of Spain, with a population of 58,000, there were 810 committals in 1837, being 1 in 72 of the population only. In Russia, the proportion is but 1 in 100,000. In Belgium, in 1834 [*Rapport au Roi*, 183] (and the statistics have varied little since), where the population was about 4,100,000, the accusations in the higher and lower criminal courts amounted to 2,423, being 1 in 1,700 of the population; less than one-fourth of the criminality of England. The whole number of other offences in the courts of simple police, was 24,278 (of which, however, no less than 7,773 were mere offences against forest laws and rights of fishing),

26,703 in the whole; so that about 1 only in 160 of the population is a violator of the laws; again a result four times as favourable as that of England."

The coincidence is surely remarkable, that crime, especially against property, should be so far less frequent where Confession exists as a recognized and energizing part of religion, than where it does not [1].

To turn to another category of offences, those of unchastity, against which S. Peter has delivered such an emphatic anathema in his Second Epistle, declaring this vice to be chief of transgressions in a Christian man. For the prevention of this species of immorality the facts mentioned below afford sufficient reason for believing that the Confessional would be an operative and effectual safeguard.

In this respect again the inquirer finds that England is one of the most debased of European nations. The proportion of illegitimate to legitimate births in most of the countries in Europe is thus given in the *Statistical Society's Journal* for 1862 and 1865 :—

"Out of every 100 births the illegitimate numbered in—

Austria	9·0	Spain	5·6
Belgium	7·4	Sicily	7·3
Bavaria	22·6	Switzerland	6·0
Denmark	9·0	Tuscany	6·0
Hanover	10·0	Wirtemberg	16·0
Holland	4·0	Russia	0·2
Norway	9·2	France †	7·5
Prussia *	8·4		
Kingdom of Sardinia	2·9		
Saxony	15·3		

* In the Protestant part one in every 10·78; in the Catholic portion one in 16·35 only.

† In the Department of the Seine, 26·75. Urban districts, 12·0. Rural districts, 4·2. In La Vendee and Brittany one in 46 only. In Cotes D'Or one in 82.

The proportion of all England and Wales is 6·5 in every 100; in Scotland about 10·0; in Ireland less than 3·0, and those cases mainly in the North."

---

[1] After these pages were composed, two facts (doubtless among thousands such) were communicated to the writer, which strongly corroborate the view herein taken as to the great influence Confession would have in preventing crimes against property. A sum of 490*l.* has just been recovered by an Insurance Company under these circumstances :—A person confessed to an Irish Priest that he had inherited a property as to which an ancestor had perpetrated a fraud on the office to the above amount, thirty years previously. The Priest ascertained the truth of the statement, and directed restitution, which was made accordingly. The other is this :—A sum of thirty shillings was, a week or two since, received by a neighbouring clergyman from a Roman Catholic Priest in one of the western suburbs of London, who stated that it was 'Restitution Money' from a person who had confessed to him that he had appropriated it wrongfully.

According to this table, England and Wales apparently stand seventh in the scale of morality, those superior to her being Russia, Tuscany, Spain, Sardinia, Ireland, Switzerland, and Holland; in reality, however, France, Belgium, and Austria also. For the excessive criminality of the Department of the Seine (including a population of 3,500,000), where the illegitimate births are nearly 27 in 100, of Brussels, where they are about 32 in 100, of Vienna, where they are 51 in the 100, and Prague, where they are 46 in 100—large cities where the clergy have diminished influence, the resort of dissipated and profligate characters, often foreigners, and where moreover the police regulations against open and public prostitution are very strict and severe—raises unduly the average, which, excluding those capitals, would be far lower than that of England. In Bavaria, moreover, where the population is one-third Protestant, there exists an atrocious state of law, which forbids marriage unless the contracting parties satisfy the authorities that they are capable of maintaining a family independently of extraneous aid. This of course leads to many secret marriages and illicit connexions, so that this country ought to be excepted from the average. Without, however, taking any of these modifying circumstances into consideration, excluding, however, Bavaria for the reasons above given, and Switzerland as a neutral quantity, but including Holland, it will be found, that in those countries in which the ordinance of Confession is established the illegitimate births are less than one-half in number what they are in those in which it practically exists not.

And here a few words on the unhappy reason why London and other large towns of Great Britain, and also Holland, are apparently comparatively moral in this respect, and that in their cases the average of this species of immorality is far below that of the great cities of the Continent; for it is the fact that in this respect the urban population of Great Britain appears to be, which it most certainly is not, comparatively pure, the rural the most corrupt; whilst on the Continent the reverse is evident.

There can be no doubt, as Mr. Lumley, in his able *Poor Law Reports*, has often hinted, that this difference is owing to the prevalence of what has been justly called the 'Social Evil;' to the licence, it may in truth be called encouragement, which in the populous districts of this country, and notoriously in Holland, is given to public prostitution. Of course there will be no illegitimacy among Mohammedans and Hindoos, in Japan and China, or the African tribes, nor also among those who live much in the same mode.

Let the opponents of Confession consider well the circumstances hereinafter detailed:—In London the number of fallen women has been estimated as high as 60,000, and as low as 20,000. Taking the mean, however, at 40,000 [1], and the population at 3,200,000, it will be found that 1 woman in every 40 is of this character, that is to say, 1 in every 20 of those women who are of age are unchaste. Many have been the indignant but unheeded remonstrances published from time to time on this point, showing the disastrous consequences which result to the health and morals of the army, of the tens of thousands of clerks, shopmen, artisans, operatives, and other youths who crowd this metropolis, and the scandal and astonishment which the liberty which these abandoned women enjoy of plying in the public streets and places of resort, causes to strangers and foreigners, in whose capitals nothing of the kind is permitted. The grievous facts are, from a false prudishness, suppressed or passed over in silence. In Lambeth, in 1831, a parochial visitation revealed that in a population of 84,000, there were more than two thousand of this class [see *Statistical Society's Journal*, vol. 1], that is to say, 1 in every 10 of adult women belonged to it. In Glamorganshire, two or three years later [*Ibid.* vols. 2 and 3], it appears that in a population of 285,000, there were 4,500 and upwards of these unhappy women. In Birmingham, in 1864, there were 966 disreputable houses where they resorted; in Manchester, 1,111; in Liverpool, 1,578; in Leeds, 313; in Sheffield, 433 [*Ibid.* for 1864]. In Bristol, Hull, and Newcastle it is as bad. Of course these poor creatures cannot subsist in their wretched trade without very numerous customers. And here we have revealed a raging disease, a social plague-spot in English Society, which runs through every grade, especially the artisan, manufacturing, and lower commercial class, who, as we have seen in general, never enter a church, and do not know what any kind of Confession means. There is no need, in addition, to dwell on the revelations of the Divorce Court, which prove that Englishmen are nearly as bad in this respect as the Northern Germans. There is none who is acquainted with the condition of the families of the artisans, who does not know the sad frequency with which they abandon their wives, and how frequently they live in a state of concubinage; how impure their language

[1] Perhaps this average of 40,000 may be estimated as approximating the real number, though it is probably below the actual number; for in the statistics issued by the Board of Trade in 1867, the number of women who are known to the Metropolitan Police to be gaining a livelihood by their unholy traffic, is set down as 28,100.

and habits constantly are; and what small regard they usually pay to the dictates of modesty.

But enough of these painful statements.

That the introduction of this system of Confession and Penitence would be immediately successful, and forthwith at once cure this chronic social malady, inveterate in England for the last century and a half, is not to be hoped for even by the most sanguine; but surely the facts now advanced lead with an impartial mind to the conclusion that, if cautiously and gradually, and so universally adopted, it would greatly check and alleviate it; and those who have had the opportunity of observing the well-ordered condition of Ireland, France, Belgium, Spain, especially of Rome, and the cities of North Italy (at least up to a late period) in this respect, will scarcely hesitate in their opinion. The 'Catholic Religion' will not, cannot, produce its due effects for the amelioration of mankind, if it be preached and practised by instalments only, and one of the most important be omitted. In its completeness, who doubts its ability to regenerate the most degraded of human beings?

XI. But he that would do his utmost to reform his degraded fellow-countrymen in this respect, remembers with grief how unfit in general the clergy of the Church of England are to undertake this momentous task—how few are qualified, even if they were willing, to act as Confessors. The far too early period at which they are allowed to become Priests, a dignity which, in the other divisions of the Catholic Church is not conferred till the age of thirty, the repugnance which most of them feel to assume this delicate and responsible office, from a secret consciousness that they are unworthy of exercising it, and incompetent to its duties; their unwillingness to undertake that which requires so strict a rule in themselves, and the ignorance respecting the whole nature of the Institution which prevails, are all sad obstacles to its re-establishment. How small a portion come up to the standard of Origen (*Hom.* ii. *in Psalm.*) :—

"Only be diligently circumspect to whom thou dost confess thy sin. First prove the Physician to whom thou must explain the causes of thy sickness, whether he knows how to be weak with them that are weak, and to weep with them that weep; whether he thoroughly understands the discipline of condoling and compassionating, so that he may first show himself to be a physician so skilful, so merciful, that thou mayest do and follow whatever the counsel may be which he gives thee. This can only be attained after great forethought, and the advice of a thoroughly-skilled physician."

The unhappy disuse, and consequently disrepute, into which this wholesome Discipline has fallen, contributes to the diffi-

culty. It is certain, from the authorities above cited, that it was carried on to a certain extent up to the end of the reign of Queen Anne. The writer once saw in a collection of autographs (which he has not since succeeded in tracing), a letter from Bishop Burnet, signed by him, in reply to another Bishop, whose name was not stated. The latter had written to inquire what form of Absolution he (Burnet) used when persons came to confess to him. He (the inquirer) had said that he was in the habit of using that in the Office for the Sick, but wished to know what was Burnet's practice. The reply of the latter was this :— That, in his opinion, either was proper, but that he himself used that in the Office for Holy Communion. In the reigns of the First and Second Georges, came in Semi-Arian Bishops, and a Semi-Socinian Clergy, the era of meanness in Church architecture and worship, of neglect and disparagement of the Sacraments, and of mediocrity and indifference in all sacred subjects ; but of luxury and self-indulgence in private life. Then, in consequence, the middle and lower classes fell away from the Church, and the practice of Confession seems altogether to have gone into desuetude ; a neglect but too accordant with the proclivities of fallen man naturally averse to the "Discipline of Humiliation," as Bourdaloue, after Tertullian, terms it ; and which, moreover, chimed in but too well with the easy-going, self-pleasing, and unpractical religion and vicious habits of society, which then, as now, prevailed. "Oh, que mal," says Madame Swetchine, "est facile à faire, et combien la réparation est lente et difficile !" It will require a century at least, with every appliance to boot, to recover the ground which Christian honesty, purity, and morality have lost by disuse of the Ordinance of Confession.

Nevertheless the danger is urgent. It is these demoralized classes of which we have spoken who are now clamouring for greater power in the State, and will probably ere long obtain it. The portentous magnitude of the evils pointed out in the preceding pages, the existence and threatening aspect of which no one who has inquired into the matter can deny, form a cogent reason with a lover of his country, of true religion and pure morality, why the attempt should at once vigorously and systematically be made.

What, then, can be clearer than this—that the Clergy are themselves sacredly bound, in the first place, strictly to regulate their own consciences by this Discipline. Let every Priest, with Comber (*Office for making Priests*, p. 363), firmly believe—

"that so much of the Holy Ghost and His gifts were imparted to him when he was made a Priest as are necessary for the discharge of that Office to which

the SPIRIT hath called him; so much as will qualify him to judge rightly concerning remitting and retaining of sins, that GOD may ratify his sentence in Heaven: so will he bring a great and deserved veneration upon all his solemn acts of ecclesiastical discipline, as well as an incredible benefit to his people's souls."

If this be really done, none will be any longer cowards and afraid to publish these weighty verities, or regard with any thing but pity the outcry of those who hate and denounce Confession because, if practised, they would have to reveal their own iniquities. Each must boldly speak the truth in this matter, and constantly proclaim that it is the duty of all men, old and young, habitually and sincerely to employ this remedy for their sinfulness: in other words, he must call upon them to REPENT. It is the backwardness and remissness of the clergy in asserting their powers, and in preaching this duty, that gives any weight which may attach to the agitation against it. Let them take the advice of George Herbert (*The Parson Comforting*, ch. xv.), and "follow the Church's counsel in persuading their flocks to particular Confession, labouring to make them understand the great good use of this ancient and pious Ordinance[1]."

Further, let the habit of sincere and solemn Confession be made an indispensable part of the education of every boy and girl in these realms. In this dissolute age it is as needful for one sex as for the other, especially among the poorer and labouring classes. If once the good habit be adopted, the child in maturer age will scarcely depart from it; and let this Confession, in the words of Bourdaloue in his admirable Sermon on this subject, not be

"That vague and indeterminate Confession by which we protest generally that we are sinners, without specifying wherein or in what particulars we are such; nor even that mental and interior Confession only which we make to GOD from the bottom of our hearts, which consists merely in acknowledging to Him what He already knows and we cannot hide from Him; for to such acts no depth of feeling or great efforts of humility are requisite—we even

---

[1] The writer is glad to be able to recommend, in the words of another, a recently published Manual on this subject:—"As the Sacrament of Penance is more and more frequented by members of the English Church, so the want of a book to guide the Clergy in the due performance of their duties as Confessors has long been felt. This want is now, we are glad to say, being supplied. *The Priest in Absolution* (Masters) should be in the hands of every Clergyman, and should be diligently studied. It must be remembered that it is a book for the Clergy only. We trust that the second part may be speedily forthcoming."—*The Church News*, March 13, 1867.

thus do ourselves honour and it is apparently a mark of piety;—but I mean that Confession instituted by JESUS CHRIST, and which the Church has ever used; that Confession in which we descend into details, where we are not contented with saying 'we have sinned,' but where we bear particular witness as to this or that sin against ourselves, 'this is what I have thought,' 'this is what I have done,' 'this is the passion which overcame me,' 'this is the motive, the interest which caused me so to act,' 'this is the shame of my life,' 'for it is in this, and in that, that I have betrayed the cause of my GOD.'"

Such a Confession will be to all in early age an effectual restraint from the commission of sin, an invaluable comfort and aid to restoration when it has been committed, as well as, in the words of Dr. Hakewill (*Answer to Curier*, p. 266), "a marvellous ease and settlement to a poor distressed conscience."

But if the subordinate Clergy ought thus to discipline themselves, courageously proclaim and earnestly press this healing regimen upon their people, there are surely still higher duties incumbent on the chief Governors of the Church, who should be "ensamples to the flock." Here, too, alas, the inquirer has but too much reason for regret: with two or three honourable exceptions the laity have heard but little in favour of Confession from them; their words have been words of discouragement rather than of assistance. But in the language of William Turner, one of the Reformers (*Tracts of the Anglican Fathers*, ii. 196):—"Let the head rulers in the Church tell a cause why they do differ and abhor so greatly the Apostles' rites and teachings." To them in an especial sense belong the powers bestowed on the Apostles; so that in the early Church all great and doubtful cases were reserved for their decision. They are the persons who ought above all others to seek to redintegrate and revivify this mighty arm of the Church—this cleansing and purifying machine, this "wholesome medicine," this healthful antidote against the scepticism and immorality of the age. If, as is but too true, very many of the English Clergy are incompetent or unwilling to act as Confessors according to their bounden duty and obligation, let them be instructed how to do so; or, in the words of the same William Turner: "Let the Bishops appoint learned men to hear Confessions and not blockheads, and then shall the people come to the Priests by heaps and swarms." As King Edgar's Canons say:—"On a wise Confessor is greatly dependent the needful help of a sinful man and a rational repentance, just as on a good leech is the necessary remedy of disease." Lyndewood will supply very reasonable and just methods to this end. Rules also are wanting to guide Confessors in their modes of procedure with these penitents; for instance as to fit times,

places, postures, order, expressions, and in particular respecting the examination or moving to confess of the penitents, who as Dr. Hakewill remarks, "may be ignorant of the quality or quantity of their sins," yet, as Edgar's Canons say again:—"No leech can well cure ere the venom be out;" and every one of them may be willing, though unable, fully and freely to disclose his sins. It is doubtless most desirable, in the case of youth especially, that the utmost discretion should be used, and care taken not to stir up too vividly the remembrance of past transgressions, nor to quicken the germs of others which have never yet had an existence, and not to drive any one to despair.

Here are specimens of such Rules from the above-mentioned Canons of King Edgar (Thorpe's *Laws of England*, ii. 26):—

"He who is the physician of men's souls and the confidant of their actions must consider this distinction and difference—how he shall shrive their deeds and yet not condemn nor make them despairing. . . . When a person wishes to confess his misdeeds, first hear him patiently how his conduct be regulated. If he can and will humbly confess, and thou feelest sensible that he repents of his sins, teach him kindly and tenderly. If he cannot confess his offences and meditate on his sins, question him regarding his ways, and extort his sins from him, and inquire into his actions. In every deed a discreet judge shall widely distinguish how it be done, and where, and when."

So again in a modern book (Reuter's *Neo Confessarius*, Paris, 1850):—

"It is not necessary to examine those who, it appears, know all that belongs to integrity of Confession. . . . But if examination be necessary, let it be conducted with due regard to age, condition, sex, and employment, and in those points only in which the penitent is most likely to be guilty. In the matter of chastity the mode of proceeding must be cautious, lest by chance the penitent become informed of what he knows not and had better not know. If he deny thoughts, let him not be asked as to acts, unless he be very ignorant: for some men do not think of thoughts as sin; such should be asked first of deeds, then of words, last of all of thoughts. . . . But in this examination, if the penitent open not his heart, let him not be too curious or excessive, lest he render himself or that Sacrament itself odious which CHRIST willeth to be a safeguard, and so occasion his spiritual ruin."

At all events, let the Bishops and Clergy cast away the fear of this world; and, as they value the rising generation, for the sake of the purity, honour, and probity of the youth of Great Britain in every station of life, let them strenuously endeavour to resuscitate, and again to give new energy and operation in the Church of England to this wholesome Discipline, this Heavenly preservative against the corruption that is so rife around them.

Youth are emphatically and advisedly mentioned; for, thinks

the inquirer, it must not be denied, nor the unfortunate fact concealed, that through long disuse, through the systematic and malignant hostility of a bigoted party, echoed by a portion of the press, the adult members of the Church of England have, in great measure, been alienated from, and are now set against the revival of this Ordinance. A lie, however monstrous, often reiterated and insisted on, by a law of human nature, becomes at last, by mere force of repetition, to be regarded as a truth in the popular mind; especially when it panders to the ease, luxury, carelessness, and laxity of the age. So, the observance of Confession and Penitence, once universal throughout Christendom, is now, as in the days of Hoadley, belied, calumniated, and hooted down, even by persons of an average morality and religious profession, as an unwarranted assumption of Priestly power, an usurpation of the Attributes of GOD, an unnecessary curtailment of Christian liberty, an intolerable mental tyranny and bondage, a burthen on consciences, and even as an encouragement to vice!

The obvious answer to all such invectives is, of course, found in the fact, now established beyond cavil as an absolute certainty in the inquirer's mind, that the sacred Institution so assailed is, notwithstanding this opposition, the Ordinance of GOD Himself, "Who hath committed such power unto men;" and one of the great appointed means of grace which cannot be neglected without peril. To condemn and reject it because it has been, and will continue to be, criminally abused (as are and will be all the good gifts of GOD), or unwisely exercised, is to condemn and banish from the world all, even temporal authority, every innocent pleasure, the exercise of all the faculties whether of mind or body, the existence of the clergy, and almost every external act of religion. Such allegations are, therefore, utterly and conspicuously sophistical and baseless, and in reality nothing else than pretences put forth to cover a hatred of true self-sacrificing, self-denying, practical religion. Nor, again, can the obligation to confess be in any wise a burthen on the well-regulated conscience, or a fetter upon Christian liberty; "for," as Bourdaloue, quoting S. Zeno, says:—

"The Confession which, in conformity with the laws of Christianity, we make at the tribunal of Penitence, is not a false Confession, wrested from us by fear, or by the violence of torture; but a free, voluntary act, wherein of ourselves, and of our own free will, we open our hearts with love, with penitence of spirit: and wherefore? because we know that it cannot be otherwise than advantageous to us, and that if GOD require it of us, it is not that He may overwhelm and ruin us, but that He may have an occasion for loading us with the most abundant and most precious of His favours."

If all this be so, the greater, the more pressing, is the responsibility, the necessity, which lies upon the Heads of the Church in particular, and upon the Clergy in general, to exhort, to persuade, even to compel, their flocks to frequent this tribunal of Penitence; to provide that Confessors shall be fully qualified for the execution of their duty, and that it shall be carefully, and guardedly, and constantly practised. Surely, if that were the case, and the true bearings and benefits of this healthful and soul-reviving and protecting spiritual exercise were fully, and fairly, and kindlily explained and set forth, there would not be a parent, or guardian, or employer of youth in these realms, who had the welfare of his children, or pupils, or work-people at heart, who would not be earnestly anxious for its immediate and permanent re-establishment; and, if himself of mature age and desirous of acting upon his Christian faith, would not eagerly embrace this happy instrument and aid towards benefiting his moral being and saving his soul.

As to the general bearing of such a revival upon the welfare of the Church of England our Mother, in conclusion, the affectionate and well-weighed words of Dean Hickes shall be quoted :—

"I feel the non-user and abuser of this sacred power in the Church of England hath been a great ingredient in the judgments that formerly and of late have fallen upon it, and particularly of the progressive contempt of her Clergy and growing number of her enemies. For the neglect of using this power to the great and holy end for which GOD hath appointed it, and of using it in such a manner as is not agreeable to the holy nature and solemnity of such a Divine institution, I may justly say are the high places in the Church of England [responsible], which ought always and by all means to endeavour the restoration of the ancient godly Discipline in its purity, in conjunction with her Apostolical government and purity of doctrine and worship: and would the Governors of the Church, in sincerity and with the sense of their duty, go about this good work which is wanting to complete our reformation, GOD, I trust, would give success to their faithful endeavours; and when it was done He would, with the pure, strict, ancient Discipline, restore the Church and her Clergy to their ancient veneration; He would then multiply the number of her friends as fast as He hath suffered her enemies to increase—nay, then He would make her enemies, her worst enemies, to be at peace with her and become her good friends."

JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS.

On the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical.

If any inquiring visitor to our great metropolis, when passing down Whitehall, should turn to the right into Downing Street—that mysterious abode of comparatively novel and somewhat unconstitutional authority—he would discover that the first entrance presenting itself was a half-glazed door of modest appearance, approached by a few steps. If, upon entering, he should still prosecute a right-hand course, mount a mean and gloomy stone staircase, and on arriving at the top should once again follow the direction of his right hand, he would soon find himself landed in a lobby or ante-room, containing, among other articles of domestic furniture, an unpretending cottage piano-forte. Then, on opening a door immediately facing him, he would see an inner chamber of modern appearance, and, except for some arrangement at the hither end of it, looking very much like the dining-room of a considerable mansion. A capacious fireplace, a long and wide table, an array of solid chairs, and some unlighted wax candles rather ostentatiously set out, at least during the winter months, with rigid and unvariable precision on a side table—all these adjuncts might fairly suggest to our visitor's mind the idea of some comfortable and prospectively even festive banqueting-room, rather than of a Court of Judicature. He must, however, altogether abandon any such notion; and he may assure himself, notwithstanding any misgivings from outward appearances, that he is in the Chamber of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—a Court of Final Appeal in certain Causes arising within her Britannic Majesty's Dominions.

But if our visitor should at first experience any feeling of surprise at the domestic character and social appearance of the place itself in which final judgments practically are pronounced (for of the hazy legal fictions connected with this Court it is not needful to speak), thus closing up all hope of future rectification in the event of a miscarriage in justice; it is hardly likely that his surprise would be diminished on a closer inspection of the peculiar methods of proceeding here adopted. He would probably see about five (though the number is not always the same) elderly

gentlemen in plain morning costume, unless, indeed, any one of them should appear, as on a late occasion, in yachting attire, sitting at the large table above mentioned. They represent the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In an enclosure at the hither end of the table aforesaid about the same number of gentlemen of the long robe usually appear, surrounded by law books, blue bags, and voluminous printed papers required by the mode of procedure established in this Court. These learned persons in turn are wont to address their arguments to the Judicial Committee from a small desk; but the speeches, unlike harangues delivered before respectable juries in Courts of Common Law, are not for the most part of an exciting character, being neither calculated, nor indeed intended, to work very sensibly on the feelings. To tell the truth, an atmosphere of extreme dulness usually pervades the place. A reporter, close to the speaker, plies his vocation with observable, and indeed with official, assiduity; a few straggling spectators—some, perhaps, interested in the cause in hand, others, idly looking on because they have no more pressing engagement—complete the scene.

And now, our visitor having finished his general inspection of what outwardly meets the eye, might perchance feel disposed to turn his mind to the subject-matter occupying the attention of this Tribunal of final resort. The arguments would, in all probability, turn upon a previous judgment delivered in an Admiralty Court or in some Court of Colonial Judicature.

In the former case, it is not unlikely that the topics urged by the learned advocates would have reference to some one or more of the following matters—to the colours of the lights, whether white, green, or red, shown at night by a vessel on her voyage, with particular regard to the position in which such lights were exhibited—to the porting or starboarding of a helm—to letting fly a jib or hauling over a foresail at the proper moment for a tack—to the integrity of a chain-cable, or the efficiency of a mooring-link—to steaming at full power or half steam on—to easing or stopping a marine engine—to the wakefulness of a captain, or to the sobriety or the prudence of an officer of the watch. Such are not unlikely to be the subjects of argument in case the appeal was from an Admiralty Court.

If, on the other hand, the appeal was from a Colonial Court, the subjects might perhaps take a somewhat wider range; for the Judicial Committee, under a very modern statute—to say nothing of any jurisdiction previously inherited through the Privy Council itself—hears appeals from the Courts in the plantations of America, and other her Majesty's dominions abroad,

from the Courts of Sudder Dewanny Adawlut in the three Presidencies of India, and from the Courts of Judicature to the eastward of the Cape of Good Hope, thus embracing the vast continent of Australia. Considering this somewhat wide expanse of jurisdiction, and the variety of causes of litigation thence arising, it would, of course, be out of the question even to surmise what would be the topics which our visitor might hear discussed in the case of a colonial appeal. This much, however, may be said, if the appeal were from India, the names of the litigants would probably be almost unpronounceable by Europeans—if from Australia, the controversy would very possibly turn on the right to a sheep-walk, or on a consignment of wool.

But if our visitor were tempted on another occasion to pay a second visit to this Chamber, he might, perhaps, find the same Tribunal and the same advocates engaged upon very different subject-matters. He might find this Court engaged in discussing the awful mysteries of the Eternal World, or some of those deep verities which are the precious inheritance of every true branch of the Church Universal. For this is a Tribunal which also undertakes to decide, in final resort, upon the fitness or unfitness of a Clergyman for the cure of souls in the Church of England. His Bishop may have judged his doctrines to be heretical. On appeal to the Archbishop's Court such judgment may have been there affirmed by the Archbishop's deputy, which is precisely the same as though the Archbishop had pronounced the judgment in person. And perhaps it might not be useless for Archbishops and Bishops more frequently to sit as judges in their own Courts, in order to convince simple folk that judgments there are spiritual, and not lay judgments. However, after a Clergyman has been pronounced unfit by the Bishop of a diocese and by the Archbishop of a province to be entrusted with the spiritual care of a parish, this Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—of which no Ecclesiastic is by the general law a member—undertakes to set Archbishop and Bishop right, and, in fact, to control the Chief Pastors of the Church in their admission of Clergymen to the cure of souls, and the retention of them in that sacred office.

Now our visitor, if previously unacquainted with this strange anomaly in English Jurisprudence, would probably, nay perhaps certainly experience considerable amazement at what he witnessed. He might naturally be inclined to inquire how so unintelligible a state of affairs in a Christian country had arisen. And if he prosecuted his inquiries, he would discover some revelations, historical and legal, which would hardly tend to diminish his surprise. To such supposed inquiries the present object is to

answer as briefly as the nature of the case will permit; only now premising that this strange jurisdiction fell at haphazard to the lot of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council by a recent blunder and accident—a blunder and accident hereafter to be treated of in detail, but which, it may now suffice to say, arose from that unhappy love of verbiage too often indulged in by members of that profession, of which an important branch, in the words of Lord Westbury, is paid "by the yard," rather than in proportion to the accuracy or penetration with which its duties are discharged. But of all this more particularly in its proper place, as we proceed.

The present gradation of Ecclesiastical Appeals in England was settled (with the exception of this remarkable Final Court, which is only thirty-four years old) so far back in the history of our country, that one cannot pretend to specify the exact date when such gradation was first established. But at any rate, it is sufficient for our purpose to know that the present practice, then previously existing (of course with the above-mentioned exception), was precisely defined by the Constitutions of Clarendon, A.D. 1164. By the 8th of those Constitutions, the first step was from "the Archdeacon to the Bishop; the second, from the Bishop to the Archbishop; and, thirdly, if the Archbishop failed to do justice, recourse might be had to the King, by whose order the controversy was to be decided in the Archbishop's Court. Nor should it be lawful for either of the parties to the suit to move for any further remedy without leave from the Crown." Thus, it is observable in the first place, in case the Archbishop failed to do justice, and recourse was had to the King, that still the controversy was to be decided in the Archbishop's Court, and not elsewhere: it was not to be taken out of the hands of the Church; the judgment was to be a spiritual one, and the proceedings governed by the methods of the Court Christian. It is also observable, in the second place, that the last clause, forbidding further process without royal assent, was a clear prohibition of appeals to Rome, except by the King's leave, which may easily account for Pope Alexander III.'s assault upon this Article. It is not necessary to detain our readers now over the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, their origin, objects, or effects; nor over the endeavour of one party in this country to prosecute appeals to Rome, and of another to prevent such proceedings; it is sufficient for our present purpose to know that the gradation of Ecclesiastical Appeals within the realm remained as above specified, by the Constitutions of Clarendon, from A.D. 1164 to A.D. 1533.

A.D. 1533. In this year a change was made by the Great Statute of Appeals (24 Hen. VIII. 12). By this Act two alterations were effected:—1. The Upper House of Convocation in each Province was made the Final Appeal Court in certain specified classes of causes relating to wills, matrimony, divorce, tithes, oblations, and obventions "in any way touching the King." 2. The power of the Crown to allow an appeal to Rome from the Courts of the Archbishops, as permitted by the Constitutions of Clarendon, was abolished for the aforesaid classes of causes touching subjects only. Thus, beyond all controversy for those specified causes, the Upper Houses of the Convocations became absolutely final resorts if the Crown was interested in the suit. The Archbishops' Courts for such causes became absolutely final resorts in any other case.

A.D. 1534. In this year the next change occurred. 1. The final jurisdiction of the Upper Houses of the Convocations was extended from the specified classes of causes above mentioned to all Ecclesiastical causes whatsoever, in case they "touched the King." 2. In all others whatsoever, not "touching the King," an appeal was given from the Archbishops' Courts to the Crown. Such was the effect of the Statute 25 Hen. VIII. 19, usually called the "Clergy Submission Act;" for the 3rd section submitted the "King's causes" to the same jurisdiction as before, viz. the Upper Houses of the Convocations; the 4th section enacted that in the case of other Ecclesiastical causes triable in the Archbishops' Courts, an appeal should lie to the King in Chancery, whence Commissioners should be appointed by delegation to hear and determine the controversy. Hence the origin of the High Court of Delegates. So from that date, except during a brief space in Queen Mary's reign, the Upper Houses of the Convocations have been in each Province the Final Appeal Courts by Statute in causes "touching the King," to this hour. But the Court of Delegates held its jurisdiction over ordinary Ecclesiastical litigation, exclusively touching subjects in the Archbishops' Courts, down to the year 1832 only.

A.D. 1832. In this year a Statute (2 & 3 Will. IV. 92) was passed, which transferred this appellate jurisdiction over such causes as were triable in the Archbishops' Courts, and did not "touch the King," from the Crown in Chancery, *i.e.* practically from the High Court of Delegates, to the Crown in Council, *i.e.* to his Majesty's whole Privy Council.

A.D. 1833. In this year the appellate jurisdiction over such causes as were triable in the Archbishops' Courts, and did not "touch the King," was again transferred from his Majesty's

Privy Council, and was conferred by Statute (3 & 4 Will. IV. 41), but by mischance and without intention, as shall be shown particularly in detail at the proper place, on the *Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*, a body now retaining the functions then unintentionally entrusted to it.

Such is a brief statement of the four changes which have passed upon this Appellate Jurisdiction, and have landed it in its present form, according to the general law, among us; for it is not at this point needful to take into account that clumsy patch of a partial arrangement which in 1840 (by the Clergy Discipline Act, 3 & 4 Vic. 86), was cobbled on to the Final Ecclesiastical Appeal System, by way of hiding defects in the bad workmanship of previous legislation.

It will be well, however, now to step backwards, and to consider more accurately in detail those four changes which have been made.

In 1533, as was above stated, the Upper House of Convocation in each Province was made the Court of Final Appeal in certain "matters touching the King." Final appellate jurisdiction still belongs to those assemblies, distinctly conferred on them by the Statutes of the realm, and confirmed by the authority of every text-writer of credit, without exception, who has treated on the subject. This fact, however, seems seriously to have disturbed the calm judgments of some persons in our own days, not even excepting the ornaments of the Judicial Bench, and the most remarkable and memorable endeavours have been made to disable in this respect the Statutes 24 Hen. VIII. 12. 9, as confirmed by 25 Hen. VIII. 19. 3, and to annihilate the authority of the whole phalanx of text-writers on this subject.

For this Final Appellate Jurisdiction of the Upper Houses of the Convocations was the subject of discussion before our three Common Law Courts in the year 1850. The Court of Queen's Bench, by the mouth of Lord Chief Justice Campbell, first declared against the Convocational jurisdiction. The methods of reasoning adopted by that Court are not altogether convincing, nor indeed are they clear. But thus much is clear to demonstration, that the Court of Queen's Bench, by throwing pell-mell all the historical events of 1533 into 1532, and those of 1534 into 1533, succeeded at last in deciding that King Henry VIII. was "*impatient to marry Anne Boleyn*" when Queen Elizabeth, the issue of that union, was five months old, thus declaring the English Crown in the person of our heroic Queen to be illegitimate. The Court, following the same historical method, decided that More was Lord Chancellor, when he certainly was not; and that Audley was not

Lord Chancellor when as certainly he was. Now, if all these odd averments had been true, instead of being absurdly false, it is not clear to a common understanding how they could have affected the case in hand; yet the above, with some other matter equally unconvincing, appeared to the Court of Queen's Bench sufficient grounds for disabling the plain words of the statute of 1533 distinctly confirmed by that of the following year. But, of course, as the Court of Queen's Bench trampled down facts, dates, and historical records into a hopeless mass of inextricable confusion, whatever Westminster Hall may say, the outer world cannot be expected to accept a conclusion arrived at by such extraordinary methods against the right of the Upper Houses of the Convocations to receive appeals in "matters touching the King." Such a performance as that of the Court of Queen's Bench on April 25, 1850, though commended by the *Times* newspaper as a "picturesque" judgment, can never be reasonably expected to satisfy any one beyond its authors, and the Ecclesiastical authorities of that journal. And so one is amazed that such mangling of history has been solemnly referred to in a work on the present subject lately issued under the auspices of the Bishop of London, assisted by six other gentlemen. Two of them, at least, being gentlemen of the long robe, should have had some mercy on their own profession, and have forbidden the most distant allusion—not to dwell on their authoritative reprint of these marvellous historical fictions—to the ludicrous essay in history which emanated from the united researches of the learned Justices of the Queen's Bench on the day above specified.

The learned Justices of the Court of Common Pleas next followed in order, on May 27, 1850. They denied the Final Appellate Jurisdiction of the Upper Houses of the Convocations, endeavouring to disable the statutes under view by what must be called a frantic onslaught on our most approved text-writers, who without one exception, so far as appears, have uninterruptedly held that 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12, § 9, confirmed by 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, § 3, gave Final Appeals in "matters touching the King" to the Upper Houses of the Convocations. Coke, Bacon, Comyn, Ayliffe, Wooddeson, Burn, Blackstone, received unpardonably rough usage. Whether Westminster Hall was generally satisfied, one cannot pretend to say. Some distinguished persons there certainly were not. They properly stood off from accepting as a true exposition of the law a judgment which paid no respect either to the statutes of the realm or to the united authority and unbroken testimony of our greatest text-writers, and which moreover disabled Blackstone's very sensible and most reasonable conclu-

sions on the whole matter, when he says, truly in intention, but with a slight error in expression :—"In case the King himself be a party in any of these suits, the appeal does not lie to him, which would be absurd, but by Statute 24 Hen. VIII. 12, to all the Bishops of the realm assembled in the Upper House of Convocation." And most assuredly no one outside the legal precincts—notwithstanding the mysterious professional worship of precedents in the Courts—ever was, or ever will be satisfied to see the plain meaning of the English language in the Statute Book set at defiance, and all hitherto received legal literature cast to the winds.

Then followed the learned Barons of the Exchequer. They showed a manifest desire to deny the Final Appellate Jurisdiction of the Upper Houses of the Convocations in matters "touching the King." But being staggered at the previous performances in the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, and though hinting at what might be their judgment if compelled to give it, they somewhat slily evaded a definite conclusion on the specific point. Had they stopped there they had done wisely; but unhappily they permitted themselves to ramble about in the dark among the Constitutions of Clarendon, and, stumbling over a mutilated extract from the 8th above mentioned, fell into such a complication of error on July 8, 1850, as was the occasion of their hopelessly mistaking their way among the mazes of constitutional law at the time—a catastrophe from which one may cordially trust and believe that that Court at least has since been able to extricate itself. However, the event is this, that notwithstanding the struggles of the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, and the wary announcements of the Court of Exchequer, the vulgar world, and at least two of the present learned Barons of the Court of Exchequer itself—one of them, indeed, the highest ornament of that Court—unless some great change has recently taken place in their convictions, still adhere to the plain words of two unrepealed, nay confirmed (1 Eliz. 1) Acts of Parliament, supported by the unanimous consent of the text-writers on this subject, and so believe unhesitatingly that "in matters touching the King" the Upper Houses of the Convocations are still Courts of Final Appeal by Statute.

The truth is, and this is a matter which so far as appears was unknown to the fifteen learned Judges first above referred to, that the Statute (24 Hen. VIII. 12) which was passed between Feb. 4 and April 7, 1533, pointed directly at the nullification then depending of Catherine of Arragon's marriage with King Henry VIII., a matter very nearly "touching the King." In

the Episcopal volume lately published on the present subject[1], which had the advantage of composition, advice, and research, ecclesiastical, legal, and official, a remarkably odd misapprehension of history is patent on this point. We are informed in the Introduction (p. xxxviii) that "in the matter of the divorce, Queen Catherine did not appeal, having refused to acknowledge the authority of the Archbishop's Court." Now, it would not have been from the Archbishop's Court, as the Right Reverend, Reverend, and learned authors would have us believe, that Catherine would have had to appeal, but from the judgment of the Convocations of the two Provinces; and how this could have been then done, under the brand-new statute, which made the Upper House of Canterbury, and the Upper House of York final tribunals "in matters touching the King," is not altogether clear. The matter had been there concluded already; for one may venture with some confidence to affirm, that the nullification of this Princess' marriage had been adjudged in the Upper House of Canterbury, on March 29, 1533; that to fortify their decision the matter was sent down to the Lower House, and was there finally assented to on April 3; that it was confirmed by the whole Convocation of York on May 13; and that final sentence founded on those proceedings was pronounced on May 23, in the parish Church of Dunstable, as being near the Princess' residence at Ampthill. And as there appears throughout the volume above mentioned a very sensible desire to disable this Statute of 1533, in respect to the jurisdiction given to the Convocations "in matters touching the King," one may further venture to commend to the reader's notice the history of the divorce of Anne Boleyn, and that of the nullification of the marriage of Anne of Cleves, which both look the same way as the above recorded facts; the truth being that those causes "touching the King" were decided by Convocational authority in accordance with the statute law above mentioned.

There is another point worthy of consideration, as regards the change in Appellate Jurisdiction made in 1533. The world was instructed by the Court of Queen's Bench when engaged upon this subject, that the Final Appeal was given to the Archbishops' Courts in that year, only in certain cases, *i. e.* in causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorces, rights of tithes, oblations, and obventions; but that an "appeal to the Pope in all

[1] *A Collection of the Judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Ecclesiastical Cases, &c.: with a Preface by the Lord Bishop of London.* Edited (under the direction of the Bishop of London) by the Hon. G. C. Brodrick and the Rev. W. H. Fremantle. London: Murray. 1865.

Spiritual suits" was still permitted. And in accordance with this announcement it is distinctly and absolutely stated in the Bishop of London's Preface to the work before mentioned (*Preface,* ix), that at this time "Spiritual Causes would not be finally decided in the Archbishops' Courts." But this averment arises from too servile an acceptance of legal assertions and Queen's Bench *dicta,* to the entire exclusion of even a glance at ecclesiastical history. There seems here to be either some defect in research or memory, or both, as to what took place two years before in the Canterbury Convocation on Feb. 11, and in that of York on May 4, 1531, and also as to what took place nearly one year before, in the Canterbury Convocation, May 15, 1532. One really must commend a study of these particulars to those who might be misled to believe, under the sanction of the high authorities above quoted, that any appeal in matters Spiritual would have been carried beyond this realm at this period of our national history.

To sum up this matter. The Statute 24 Hen. VIII. 12 has accepted the assault of our three Common Law Courts. It has been subjected to a constant and most irritating attack from the volume lately issued under the auspices of the Bishop of London, assisted by a contingent, ecclesiastical, legal, and official. That its real offence is its stout maintenance of the authority of the Church, is pretty clear. However, as it is a noble monument, from its preamble to its last clause, still consecrated in the annals of the country, to record the true distinction between functions civil and functions ecclesiastical, it is to be hoped that all true-hearted English Churchmen will determine, each in his several place, to defend its position manfully, and so far as the Act still abides in integrity, in that defence to flash if needful the very last grain of argumentative powder.

In 1534, the next change in the Courts of Final Appeal was made by 25 Hen. VIII. 19. The Upper Houses of the Convocations were indeed continued as Final Appeal Courts, "in matters touching the King," according to the statutes and to the text-writers. For, notwithstanding the assaults above mentioned, one cleaves to their authority and opinions. But from the Archbishops' Courts, which were then final, at least in the causes before specified, an appeal was now given to the King in Chancery, who was thence to appoint delegates to hear the case. Hence the origin of the High Court of Delegates. And here it must be observed, that it was left, under the terms of the Statute, to the discretion of the Sovereign whether the judges should be Ecclesiastics or not, though it is

quite clear from the contents of the *Reformatio Legum*, that the intention was that these Delegates should be "Three or four Bishops." Whatever may be thought now—and it must be confessed that people become reconciled to the oddest anomalies by time and usage—it is certain that this statute introduced into the national jurisprudence a strange novelty, which must have appeared somewhat surprising, not to say shocking, at the time of its enactment. If the Crown had inherited even the shadow of any such power of appointing a final Ecclesiastical Tribunal of its own choice, by reason of prerogative (supreme headship was as yet unknown to the statute law), the shock might have been less sensible. But it must be borne in mind that this Court of Delegates, and the same remark will apply in some sort to the present Judicial Committee, cannot claim an existence, as did the Star Chamber and Court of Review, from Royal prerogative or supremacy at all. The date, parentage, and birth of the Court of Delegates are not shrouded in any such mysterious recesses of asserted jurisdiction. No. We can point distinctly to its age and all the circumstances of its creation. It derived its existence from a specific Statute (25 Hen. VIII. 19). And if any one should feel wonder that the Legislature of the country should have sanctioned statutably so strange a departure from ancient and received principles as to give final Ecclesiastical appeals to the Crown, with power to appoint persons of its own choice for the determination of Spiritual suits, it may be answered, that all astonishment is unreasonable at the performances of Parliament at that time of our history, when the Legislature lent itself to legalize the cruel and lustful schemes of an unnatural parent who insisted on his own children being declared illegitimate by statute (28 Hen. VIII. 7); when it was so submissive as to enact that Royal proclamations should stand as Acts of Parliament (31 Hen. VIII. 8); and when our legislators were so contemptible as to put up tamely with this insult, among other sneers on the part of their Sovereign, that "they were not to be judges of their own fantastical opinions and vain expositions."

But in however tame and servile, or it may be careless a manner, the Legislature of that day put it into the power of the Crown to select what persons it chose for the Court of Delegates in Spiritual Appeals, it is clear that the real intention was, that those persons should be Ecclesiastics. By the same Statute which gave this power to the Crown, a Commission of thirty-two persons was appointed to review the Ecclesiastical Law. That Commission did not report in the time of King Henry VIII.; but one which succeeded

to its labours did report in the next reign, of King Edward VI.; and we happily possess the result in the book, *Reformatio Legum*. Now in that public document, which was framed with a view of its being made law, under the title "Appeals," the following words are put into the mouth of the Sovereign:—"We desire when a case has been referred to the Crown, that the cause should be definitely settled by a Provincial Synod if it is a weighty matter, or by three or four Bishops to be appointed by us for the purpose." Surely this latter clause points directly to the Court of Delegates established by the same statute which originated this Commission. And whatever mixtures of laymen may since have occurred in that Court, such a mode of constituting it for Spiritual suits does not appear to have been contemplated at its first institution, nor by these Commissioners.

However, the volume lately published under the auspices of the Bishop of London is cumbered by some very laborious endeavours to prove the infrequency of Ecclesiastics, and the frequency of laymen, in the High Court of Delegates established at this period of our history. Indeed, considerable arithmetical ingenuity, and some application of the rules of proportion, have been brought to bear on Bishop Gibson, in order to disable assertions which he has made regarding the composition of that Court. The object of these calculations is to show that the last-mentioned Bishop overestimated the Ecclesiastical element in the Court in times past. But even if he has done so, and if it could be shown (which it cannot) that the High Court of Delegates since its establishment, was on every occasion of its being summoned exclusively composed of laymen, to the entire exclusion of all Ecclesiastics whatsoever—if all this could be shown (which I repeat it cannot), yet one does not exactly see what wholesome conclusion would ensue. All we should then learn would be, that too large a concession had been made to the Crown in 1534 by statute, and that afterwards such concession had been wantonly abused to the extinction of the fundamental principles of the Church of Christ, and the overthrow of all the regulations which previously governed the ancient jurisprudence of this country; and further that the original intention of the legislation under view had been disregarded. The nearer, however, such deplorable conclusions can be arrived at by the calculations, proportions, and reasonings in the volume above mentioned, the greater appears to be the satisfaction of its authors. They really seem to forget that such action of the Crown, if in their sense complete, ought hardly to be a subject

for congratulation, at least in a constitutional point of view, since the Royal Power (at least as these authors seem to proclaim its exercise) must have been abused in direct breach of King Henry VIII.'s own announcement to the Clergy of the Province of York; in direct breach of that Monarch's own declaration—still happily preserved—touching his headship; in direct breach of the noble preamble to the Great Statute of Appeals; in direct breach of the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth; in direct breach of the Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles of Religion; and in direct breach of those principles which underlie doctrinal jurisdiction in every branch of the Church Universal. One entirely fails to see, on mature consideration, that such breaches, in whatever measure or proportion they may have occurred, are any just causes at all for satisfaction with men professing to be English Churchmen, still less that they give, even in the minutest degree, any righteous occasion for a clerical or an Episcopal triumph.

A master fallacy however pervades the whole of the laborious calculations, involving one thousand and eighty cases, and the ingenious reasonings thereon founded in the Bishop of London's late volume, *A Collection of the Judgments, &c.*, with which endeavours are made to prop up the present system of Final Appeal, by reference to the constitution of the Court of Delegates in past times.

That master fallacy is this—that the *Spiritual* cases involving correction of clerks and questions of doctrine, are mixed up in a hopeless mass of confusion with *Ecclesiastical* cases, involving questions of wills, marriages, and tithes. Not one Spiritual case involving doctrine—so far as is known, and the greatest pains have been taken to obtain knowledge—was ever tried at all in the Court of Delegates till 1690, *i.e.* for one hundred and fifty-six years after the establishment of that Court. And as regards the one hundred and forty-two years which elapsed between 1690 and its annihilation in 1832, only four such cases at most are found on record. And so one concludes that a vast amount of investigation, calculation, and ingenuity has been altogether wasted, not to say misapplied, on this head, by the authors of the volume above referred to.

It is time now to take leave of the legislation of 1534 and the High Court of Delegates; adding that only one worse principle of jurisprudence can be well conceived than that which statutably authorized the appointment by the Crown of the members

of a Court—*pro hâc vice*—to try a particular case. It requires but slight consideration to perceive that such a power might lead directly to the last excesses of tyranny and injustice. That one worse principle, however, an unhappy succession of circumstances has combined to establish in England. And it is this—That the Lord President of the Council, by his very position a prominent member of a political party in the State, is now entrusted with the power of selecting particular members out of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council to try particular cases.

Before proceeding from the consideration of the earlier history to the modern development of the Court of Final Appeal in Ecclesiastical Causes, it may be well to remind the reader of the following facts above stated. In 1164 the 8th Constitution of Clarendon settled the gradation of Ecclesiastical Appeals within the realm, assigning the Archbishops' Courts here as final resorts, but allowing a further appeal to Rome if royal consent were obtained. In 1533 (1) the Upper Houses of the Convocations were statutably made final resorts for certain classes of causes in case they "touched the King." (2) The power of the Crown to permit appeals from the Archbishops' Court to Rome in the same classes of causes was annihilated. In 1534 (1) the jurisdiction of the Upper Houses of the Convocations was extended to all causes whatsoever if they "touched the King." (2) The power of the Crown to permit a recourse to Rome was abolished in all causes whatsoever. (3) From the Archbishops' Courts an appeal was allowed to the Crown in Chancery, whence delegates might be appointed to re-hear the case.

From this juncture—the establishment of the High Court of Delegates in 1534—the reader must now take a giant stride of 298 years, passing over the Courts of "Star Chamber," "Review," and "High Commission," as not necessarily pertinent to the present subject, and happily all abolished by statute. And so he will arrive at the year 1832, when the jurisdiction of the Court of Delegates in causes Ecclesiastical was transferred by Statute (2 & 3 Will. IV. 92) to his Majesty's Privy Council. This transfer took place upon consideration and premeditation, which is more than can be said of the next change which occurred, and which will have to be considered in its proper place.

In the year previous to that at which the reader has now arrived, *viz.* 1831, a Commission, composed of persons supposed qualified to judge, had reported that—"The Privy Council being composed of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, the Judges in Equity, the Chiefs

of the Common Law Courts, the Judges of the Civil Law Courts, and other persons of legal education and habits who have filled Judicial situations, seems to comprise the materials of a most perfect tribunal for deciding appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts." Whether this statement is logically correct or inexhaustive, it is not just now needful to inquire; but at any rate this is clear enough, that the Commissioners thought that one reason for commending the Privy Council, as containing elements fit for the composition of a Court of Final Appeal in matters Ecclesiastical, was that the Privy Council was partly composed of "*Lords Spiritual.*" And to this the reader's attention is specially called, as tending to support an argument hereafter to be propounded.

In the year 1832, a second Commission reported, and, adopting the views of the former one, recommended that Ecclesiastical Appeals should be transferred from the Court of Delegates to his Majesty's Privy Council. This recommendation was speedily acted upon, for (by 2 & 3 Will. IV. 92) the Court of Delegates was abolished. And now Ecclesiastical Appeals, among others, which before were to be made to the Crown in Chancery, were thenceforward to be made to the Crown in Council. Practically the jurisdiction previously exercised by the Court of Delegates was transferred to his Majesty's whole Privy Council; and this Statute was enacted in the year 1832.

On this part of our subject—the transference of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Court of Delegates to his Majesty's Privy Council—the world has lately received from very high authority some new and startling instruction. In the volume put forth under the sanction of the Bishop of London, and fortified by a combination of coadjutors, ecclesiastical, legal, and official, and moreover, in the present instance, having received additional succour from a learned author of the University of Oxford—the work on its own showing thus numbering seven contributors—it is asserted that "the claim to hear Final Appeals in matters Ecclesiastical being pre-eminently one of the original prerogatives of the Crown, is as such naturally exercised by the King in Council." (*A Collection of the Judgments, &c.* Introduction, p. lxiv.)

Without at this moment pausing to inquire particularly how a claim could possibly be a prerogative—at least it must be a very worthless one, unless the claim is granted—it is a matter of considerable interest to discover what this sentence, issued under a solemn septett of authority can possibly mean. If, as one supposes (though really the shock of surprise at this announce-

ment almost incapacitates at the moment for collected thought), the intention of these authors is to assert that it is an original prerogative of the Crown to decide on Ecclesiastical Appeals in final resort—then one cannot but feel considerable curiosity to know whence this startling information has been obtained. One may indeed be forgiven for expressing extreme anxiety to be told by this Amphictyonic Council of instruction (for its members are gathered from all quarters) what new records have been discovered vouching this "original prerogative of the Crown," and disabling that ancient footstone of our national jurisprudence —*Libera sit Ecclesia fruaturque suis judiciis.* That was consecrated in the annals of the country at least as far back as A.D. 696, and has been in effect continuously repeated in all ages of our earlier history. However if some new discovery has really been made which warrants this septemvirate assertion, it is impossible to over-estimate its historical importance, as it gives a wholesale and flat contradiction to the notable decision of the great Council of Brasted, to the contents of the Laws of King Edgar, to the Great Charter of King William I., to the Oath of Stephen, to the Constitutions of Clarendon, to Magna Charta, to all those Statutes, spreading over the reigns of at least five Kings, which confirmed that monument of the Church's freedom in judgment, to the specific request of the XIIIth chapter of the statute "Articuli Cleri" with its answer, and to the provisions of the Great Statute of Appeals.

This new discovery, if really genuine, further receives additional interest from the fact that the Parliament of 1533 must under the present supposition have by statute deprived the Crown of at least a large part of this "original prerogative," when, as these authors themselves admit, the Upper Houses of the Convocations and the Archbishops' Courts were made by special enactment final resorts. That certainly would have been a curious illustration of the royal policy of the time, nor does it fall in exactly with some of our preconceived notions of King Henry VIIIth's proceedings. And though on this occasion the exact number typical of ancient wisdom and learning is precisely reproduced in the tale of these authors, yet in their historical essay it is very hard to discover, at least at this point, an equally exact reproduction of the venerable qualifications commonly attributed to the seven of old. At any rate, the Church and the World must wait for some further revelations on this subject before it can accept in any way whatever as true this strange invocation of "an original prerogative of the Crown," which so far, as yet appears, rests for confirmation only on an undisguised desire on the part of the con-

tributors to *A Collection of the Judgments, &c.* that their reported fact was really authentic.

If, moreover, "this Final Appeal in matters Ecclesiastical" were really an "original prerogative of the Crown," it would seem to an ordinary comprehension to have been a work of supererogation on the part of our Legislature to have conferred it on His Majesty's Privy Council by statute in 1832. At any rate the Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical was as a matter of fact then given to that body by Act of Parliament, and there remained until another change was made, which shall now be considered.

In 1833, the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, a new statutable Court in English Judicature, was constituted by Act of Parliament (3 & 4 Will. IV. 41). The intention of the Legislature was to form a Court for hearing appeals from the Admiralty, Vice-Admiralty, West Indian, East Indian, Australian, and some other Colonial Courts. The Statute was drafted with that intention, and the Courts which it was intended to subject to this newly-constituted Appeal Court are specified in the Act with careful particularity. And it is at this point observable, that it is idle now to introduce questions of Royal prerogative and supremacy in reference to jurisdictions wielded by a Court definitely prescribed by an Act of Parliament, and thence deriving its present authority. In the enacting clauses of the Statute constituting this novel tribunal are specified the High Court of Admiralty in England, the Lords Commissioners in prize cases, the Vice-Admiralty Court, the Courts in the plantations of America and other his Majesty's dominions abroad, the Courts of Sudder Dewanny Adawlut in the three Presidencies of India, designating each severally by name, and the Courts of Judicature to the eastward of the Cape of Good Hope. Such is a careful specification, contained in the enacting clauses of the Act, of those courts which in the intention of the Legislature were to be subjected to this new Final Appeal Court, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But in those enacting clauses not one syllable is said of any Ecclesiastical Court, not a hint appears touching any cause of spiritual contention. It is quite clear that there was no intention—though the effect of the Act was to do so—of including our Ecclesiastical Courts; otherwise it is perfectly incomprehensible why all mention of them should have been entirely omitted in the enacting clauses, especially when we consider the careful particularity with which all the other Courts which the Legislature did intend to include are set out. It was here, however, that that disastrous mishap, that unhappy accident above referred to, occurred, subordinating our Ecclesi-

astical Courts to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and entailing consequences which Churchmen have never since ceased to deplore.

The accident happened on this wise. The learned gentleman who drafted the statute was unfortunately addicted to the love of excessive verbiage—a failing of humanity from which legal studies are not generally supposed entirely to emancipate those who pursue them—and so, after having generally described the courts which were to be submitted to the new Appellate Jurisdiction and passing on to make, in another section, provision for then pending appeals, he unhappily allowed himself to run out into some wide and general expressions, no way necessary to his subject, but big with evil. For under the capacious wordiness of his too ready pen, the jurisdiction over the Ecclesiastical Courts, though not mentioned by name, passed without intention to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, which now retains the power thus accidentally and fortuitously, as one may say, tossed to its lot. It is not too much to say that this is one of the most disastrous accidents which in public legislation has happened for many a long year. And seeing, in this instance, the woful effects of this love of verbiage and amplification and writing "by the yard," to use again the expressive words of Lord Westbury on this subject, one cannot help feeling some regret that a Bill introduced by his Lordship, which was intended partially to repress this mischievous nuisance, was lately lost.

It is remarkable at this point that in the volume above named, lately published under the auspices of the Bishop of London, it is, to speak softly, very broadly insinuated in the Preface (pp. vi, vii) that no mistake at all occurred at this juncture of our legislative history. And in a speech, founded evidently on the same grounds as those announced in his Lordship's Preface, and delivered by that Right Rev. Prelate in the Upper House of Convocation Feb. 17, 1865, his convictions on this matter are stated without any reserve whatsoever. His words were these :— "I maintain a very distinct opinion that it [*the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*] was framed with a very distinct reference to this subject [*a Final Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal*], and I ground that opinion, as I have stated elsewhere, on this fact—that the Court assumed its present form in consequence of the recommendations of a Commission, of which Archbishop Howley, Bishop Blomfield, the late Bishop of Lincoln, and other prelates formed a part. . . . . The Court was constituted in consequence of the recommendation of that Commission. Therefore, if the Court was fitted for its other duties, I think it was

the intention of those who formed it to qualify it for the performance of these [*Ecclesiastical Appeal*] duties also." The same conviction is also broadly repeated in the Bishop of London's recent *Charge* (1866) to his Clergy.

Now his Lordship on this point is evidently labouring under some very serious misapprehensions. The Judicial Committee in the aspect before us was in no sense appointed in conformity with the recommendation of the Commission referred to. On the contrary, the constitution of the Judicial Committee is antagonistic to a most important part of the contents of the Commissioners' report.

The truth is, that the Bishop of London has failed to distinguish between two distinct events which took place on two very different occasions. There exists in his Lordship's mind a manifest confusion between the transference of the jurisdiction of the Court of Delegates to the whole Privy Council in 1832, and the transference of that jurisdiction from the whole Privy Council to the Judicial Committee of that body in 1833. No mistake at all occurred on the first occasion in 1832. And so, if the Final Ecclesiastical Appeal now lay to her Majesty's whole Privy Council, his Lordship would be justified for his announcements in his recent volume, for his speech in Convocation, and for the expression of his convictions contained in his late *Charge*. But a very sad mistake indeed occurred on the second occasion in 1833, when Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was transferred to the Judicial Committee; a mistake not only not in accordance with the intention of the Commission mentioned by his Lordship, but in direct contravention of a part of that report on which he has laid so much stress. In fine, if there was no mistake on this second occasion, one is really curious to know how any one of the following four queries are to be answered with any satisfaction whatever :—

1. How is it, notwithstanding the following important passage in the Commissioners' report—"The Privy Council being composed of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, the Judges in Equity, &c. . . . seems to comprise the materials of a most perfect tribunal for deciding appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts"—how is it, one asks, though the Commissioners reported the presence of Lords Spiritual in the Privy Council as one reason why it comprised the materials for a good Ecclesiastical tribunal, that when the Judicial Committee was constructed, to which Ecclesiastical appeals then unhappily fell, not one single Spiritual Person was made a member of that Court?

2. How is it that in the enacting clauses of the Statute (3 & 4 Will. IV. 41) which specifies in precise detail all other

judicatures which were to be subjected to the Judicial Committee, no mention is made of any Ecclesiastical Court?

3. How is it that Lord Brougham, the chief author of the Act in question, establishing the Judicial Committee, gave the following testimony to the legislative blunder which had occurred? —"He could not help feeling that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had been framed without the expectation of questions like that [*the Gorham case*] . . . . being brought before it. It was created for the consideration of a totally different class of cases, and he had no doubt but that if it had been constituted with a view to such cases as the present, some other arrangement would have been made."—*Hansard* 3 *s. vol. iii. p.* 629.

4. How is it that the late Bishop Blomfield, whose name, with others, has been somewhat oddly imported into this matter (*A Collection of the Judgments, &c.*, Introduction, p. lxxi), accounted for this odd transference of jurisdiction before us by saying that the subject of the Ecclesiastical Courts on this occasion "came into no one's mind?"

If any person should give a satisfactory answer to all the above questions, one could, but not before, reasonably assent to the Bishop of London's view that Ecclesiastical Appeals were given to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council intentionally, and that no legislative accident occurred in the transfer.

It is at this point of our inquiry worthy of remark, that both in the Preface and in the Introduction to the volume above referred to (pp. vii, lxx, lxxi) the subject of the Church Discipline Act (3 & 4 Vic. 86, A.D. 1840), is mixed up with this matter before us, not without some appearance of art, and in a way very certainly calculated to throw dust in the eyes of the unwary. But the legislation on this subject in 1840 was only intended as a partial remedy, under certain circumstances, for the errors which had been committed in 1833. And, like all partial and cobbling legislation, it has done much more harm than good, only serving to complicate and confuse matters which were deplorable enough before. The words of the learned Judge of the Arches in reference to that Act truly represents its effects —"The confusion introduced by it knows no limits."

And now, having dragged a supposed visitor to Whitehall, through what one fears must necessarily have proved a somewhat tiresome historical journey, and having shown him how Ecclesiastical Appeals have legally found their way to the Chamber in which he was discovered wondering at the anomaly—it is possible that he may still feel some curiosity to know who form the

present Judicial Committee of Privy Council. The Court by Statute being composed of members of the Privy Council who hold or have held certain offices, together with two other members appointed by Royal sign manual, at this moment consists of the following noblemen and gentlemen, numbering twenty-eight persons :—

The Duke of Marlborough—*Lord President.*

The Duke of Buccleuch.	The Duke of Buckingham.
The Earl of Lonsdale.	The Marquis of Salisbury.
The Earl Granville.	Lord Westbury.
Lord Brougham.	Lord Cranworth.
Lord Wensleydale.	Lord S. Leonards.
Lord Chelmsford.	Lord Kingsdown.
Lord Cairns.	Lord Romilly.
Rt. Hon. S. Lushington.	Rt. Hon. Sir E. Ryan.
Rt. Hon. Sir J. Wigram.	Rt. Hon. Sir A. E. Cockburn.
Rt. Hon. Sir. F. Pollock.	Rt. Hon. Sir W. Erle.
Rt. Hon. Sir G. J. Turner.	Rt. Hon. Sir E. V. Williams.
Rt. Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge.	Rt. Hon. Sir R. T. Kindersley.
Rt. Hon. Sir J. P. Wilde.	Rt. Hon. Sir W. Bovill.
Rt. Hon. Sir F. Kelly.	

The reader here is particularly requested to observe that the above list consists of the names of laymen exclusively. No Ecclesiastic is a member of the Court by the general law. It is purely a lay tribunal in its original constitution, and as existing under the Act of Parliament which established it. Thus the assurance given to his Clergy in the Bishop of London's late *Charge*, that—"the chief Bishops sit in this Court" is extremely misleading, and must be received with the utmost latitude of reserve, as shall be shown directly.

The above Court does not sit in its entirety to judge of any particular case. A quorum, consisting generally of from four to six, performs the functions of the Court, and is named *pro hâc vice*, for each occasion, theoretically, by the Lord President—practically, in most cases, by the Clerk of the Council—a most objectionable method of constituting any tribunal, as involving a special selection of judges for each particular case, and so calculated, if to work no other evil, at least to diminish confidence in its judgments. Many of the above learned persons are engaged in other judicial functions, so that the real business of this Court practically, for the most part, falls to those of the number whose time is not otherwise so fully occupied.

It is not impossible that our presumed visitor might perhaps

see one, or, under present circumstances, as many as three Ecclesiastical Persons sitting at the table of the Judicial Committee; and he might, from such an apparition, be inclined to think that one had misled him as to the constitution of the Court, in assuring him that by the general law it is a purely lay tribunal. So this matter requires a word of explanation, and if any of "the chief Bishops" should be seen sitting in this Court, the abnormal fact may be accounted for in one of the two following ways.

1. The Judicial Committee itself has discovered, what indeed has not escaped the observation of other people, that to see a board composed exclusively of laymen with no peculiar character or qualifications to warrant the employment, undertaking to decide on abstruse questions of metaphysical theology and nice distinctions of fine-drawn heresies, looks like a patent flaw in the jurisprudence of the nation. And so, in order to rub a coat of varnish over this odd anomaly, the Court has availed itself on some occasions of a clause in the Judicial Committee Act, and thus has endeavoured to put a more solemn face on its proceedings. That clause empowers the Crown to summon any Privy Councillor "to attend the meetings" of the Court at any time. Now, as the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London are Privy Councillors, advantage has been sometimes taken of this power to summon one or more of those prelates in order to give a fairer appearance to a tribunal which might otherwise have seemed slenderly qualified for the decision of the cases submitted to its jurisdiction. But it is distinctly to be understood that on such occasions those Spiritual Persons are not members of the Court—they only "attend the meeting"—they are not an integral part of the tribunal, but are appended by way, as one may say, of decoration and ornament. Such was the case in the appeals, "Gorham *v.* Bishop of Exeter," and "Liddell *v.* Westerton."

2. Or, secondly, the presence of Ecclesiastics, if they do appear, may be accounted for by the following fact. In case a particular mode of proceeding established in 1840 (by 3 & 4 Vic. 86) is pursued in enforcing Church discipline, then in the event of an appeal, and then only, such Archbishops and Bishops as are Privy Councillors are members of this Court, and the proceedings cannot legally be carried on under those peculiar circumstances, without the presence of one of those prelates. The Court however appears to be so imperfectly acquainted with its own legal constitution, that it lately tried a case under the Act above mentioned without the necessary Ecclesiastical appendage. All

the proceedings were, of course, wholly "null and void in law." The case, consequently, required a re-hearing, and an instructive illustration of the proverb *γνῶθι σεαυτὸν* was supplied. A tolerable idea, however, of the amount of authority which our highest prelates are permitted to exercise in virtue of their membership, when they are summoned as actual members of the Court, may be gathered from some of the Court's late proceedings *in re Essays and Reviews*. The influence of our two Metropolitans was then reduced to the scanty measure of recording their formal dissent from the final judgment. This is an example of the weight attached to their opinion when actual members of the Court, abnormally constituted for an appeal under the Act of 1840, as last described. But if they only "attend the meeting" for ornamental decoration, as first above mentioned, then, from the example we have seen of their slender influence when sitting as members, one cannot be surprised if they shrink down to the stature of ordinary lookers-on.

Thus, should the supposed visitor chance to see one or more Ecclesiastics sitting in this Court, he is to understand that they are not members of it except under some peculiar modes of legal proceeding, which it is needless further to specify for our present purpose. He may assure himself, whatever may appear to the outward eye, that this is by the general law a purely lay court; first established by Act of Parliament in 1833, and now selected out of the noblemen and gentlemen above specified in the list given, and out of them only. And so when the Bishop of London assured his Clergy in his last published *Charge* (1866), that "the chief Bishops sit in this Court," by way of reconciling his hearers to its constitution and existence, such assurance ought not to have been given without these three substantial and important qualifications, which were unhappily and most unaccountably omitted:—(1) That only under a special mode of procedure the chief Bishops sit as members. (2) That only when specially invited they sit as attendants of the meeting. (3) That by the general law they do not sit at all.

The reader should also be further reminded that the result of careless and partial and disjointed legislation has reduced matters to this pass, which one would call ludicrous if the matter were less serious—that there are now five Courts of Final Ecclesiastical Appeal within this realm, to which application may be made on the same subject-matter under varying circumstances. To four he has been introduced—(1) The Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, in "matters touching the King;" (2) the Upper House of the Convocation of York in the like matters;

(3) the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, with some prelates conjoined in some special cases; (4) the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, consisting of laymen only by the general law; and (5) one not before mentioned as not needful to our previous survey, the Court of Delegates in Ireland.

The origin and present constitution of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a Final Ecclesiastical Appeal Court having been now described, the next step is to point out some grounds of complaint which may be specified against it.

1. It is a ground of complaint, that a Court composed exclusively of laymen should practically decide in final resort, not indeed what are or are not the doctrines of the English Church, for that is the duty of Synods, but what doctrines may or may not be publicly taught by her ministers, and this, it may be, and has been, decided in contradiction to Bishops and Archbishops of our Dioceses and Provinces. Such interference robs the Church of those inherent rights and duties, as the teacher of Christian truth, which were conferred upon her through the persons of her first Apostles and teachers by the words and acts of our LORD Himself. Those rights and duties have been consecrated by a perpetual succession through all ages of the Christian Church, specially conferred when "He ordained Twelve that they should be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach:" when He sent them forth on their Evangelical mission, and commanding them to "preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand:" when He "appointed seventy others also, and sent them two and two before His face," meanwhile attaching this Divine authority to their embassage, "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me:" when, to the ten gathered together on the evening of the Resurrection, He gave this assurance, "As My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you:" when to the eleven, as they sat at meat, authority to teach the Word was thus committed, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature:"—and, finally, when on the mountain in Galilee, the LORD ratified these Commissions to the assembled Apostles, with this promise of His own never-failing Presence annexed—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

2. It is a ground of complaint, that this Court is constituted on principles diametrically opposed to those principles which

governed the relations between Civil and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction throughout all the early ages of Christianity. This opposition may be learnt distinctly from the declarations of the Emperors Constantine, Valentinian the elder, Honorius, Theodosius II., and Basilius; from the rescript of Valentinian; from the edicts of Gratian, of Honorius, of Arcadius; from the Theodosian Code; and from the Novells of Justinian. Of this proofs are present now before the writer.

3. It is a ground of complaint, that this Court has been established by an accident, in opposition to the ancient Laws and Jurisprudence of this realm, as testified by the Acts of the mixed Council of Brasted, of the Wittena-gemote held at Greatly, by the Laws of Edgar, by the Great Charter of King William I., by the Oath of Stephen, by the Constitutions of Clarendon, by Magna Charta frequently on this subject repeated, by the Statute "Articuli Cleri," by the "Great Statute of Appeals," by the "Submission Act" as interpreted by the "Reformatio Legum," by King Henry VIII.'s Declaration to the Clergy of the Province of York, by that monarch's own explanation of his Headship, by the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, by the Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles of Religion, by the Bill of Rights, by the Common Law as set forth in the Text-writers, and by the Coronation Oath. Every one of which averments may be distinctly proved by national records.

4. It is a ground of complaint, that this Court is established in direct contravention of the principles laid down by jurists, foreign and domestic, as De Marca, Van Espen, Bracton, Sir E. Coke, Lord Bacon, Sir W. Blackstone, and by the Judges of our Court of Queen's Bench, of all which, at this moment, proofs lie before the writer.

5. It is a ground of complaint,—without for a moment impugning the brilliant talents and high attainments of individual members of the Court,—that there is not sufficient guarantee that those appointed to judge on any particular case are competent to deal with questions which may be submitted to them, as, for instance, with the fine-drawn and subtle distinctions urged respectively by the Orthodox the Nestorians, and the Eutychians, at that Council of Ephesus, which one hardly dares designate by its received name for fear of shocking the nerves of clerical readers. However, one cannot refrain from saying that that "Robber Synod"—the "Latrocinium Ephesinum"—finds itself now, in one sense at least, impressively repeated in Whitehall. And indeed there appears some substantial ground for this complaint of possible incompetence on the part of the Court, as on a

late occasion the Judicial Committee, in dealing with a passage extracted from a modern author, and seeming, so far as appears, quite unconscious that it was discussing almost the *ipsissima verba* of a writer so well known as Origen, finally succeeded in deciding that "everlasting" does not mean "lasting for ever."

6. It is a ground of complaint that the principles on which the Court proceeds are totally inadequate to needful requirements. There is a Common Law of the Church as well as a Code of Formularies. The Court has over and over again, however, assured the world that its duties are confined to deciding whether or not the formularies have been breached. Or, as it was in another quarter, with perhaps an excess of simplicity, in effect remarked that all outside the formularies lies outside the functions of the Court. But the Common Law of the Church cannot with any satisfaction, be so summarily ignored in a Court of Final Appeal. To mention two instances only—the authority of a Metropolitan over his Suffragans, and the authority of a Provincial Synod of Bishops over an individual Bishop, specially enjoined by the 6th Canon of the Second Œcumenical Council, that of Constantinople, form a part of the common law of the Church quite needful for Ecclesiastical discipline. To such Common Law, however, this Court, at least from some late experiences, appears to pay but very slender regard. Indeed, it wholly ignored all such considerations.

7. It is a ground of complaint, that the regulations and methods of procedure adopted by this Court are unsatisfactory and unsuitable to the exigencies of the case.

In the first place, the Court holds it to be insufficient in a charge of unsound doctrine that passages from the accused author should be set out in juxtaposition with the formularies alleged to be contravened. It has required, over and above this, a detailed digest of the unsound doctrine said to be maintained, and this in direct opposition to the expressed convictions of the learned Judge of the Arches, who has reasonably held that it is the proper function of a Court having the accused passages and the formularies before it to decide, without further assistance, whether the latter have been contravened or not. The demand by the Final Court for such extraneous help as this does not argue any wholesome confidence in its own capacity. Nor is it quite clear that the ingenious compositions of those who draw the pleadings may not thus become the subjects of deliberation rather than the genuine documents on which final judgment should depend.

Secondly, the practice which prevails of allowing the accused

in the lower Ecclesiastical Courts to oppose each separate article of charge, and, if such opposition is successful, then of excluding such article from the consideration of this Final Court, may be productive of the most lamentable miscarriages. If, in a charge of unsound doctrine, the Judge of the lower Court should perchance reject the right articles and retain the wrong, the whole case might fail on Appeal, not upon the merits, but in consequence of this mode of procedure, which is ill adapted to the occasion. Of course, it may be said that an Appeal would lie on the question of the rejection or retention of each separate article. But where the question of the fitness or unfitness of a clergyman for the cure of souls is in question, such interminable litigation as might thus arise is most deeply to be deprecated. And further in matters of such grave importance, and involving nice considerations of many points mutually dependent on each other, it is not too much to desire that the whole charge, as originally made, should be brought under the notice of a Final Court.

Thirdly, the admitted theory and received practice of delivering the judgment of the Court without allowing the several members to state their individual views on the matter in hand is eminently unsatisfactory in this special case. It is not impossible but that under the circumstances of this Court the opinions of the minority might, from the authority, character, and qualifications of those holding them, be entitled to the greater weight. The authority of judgments and the weight of precedents are not wholly irrespective of the character of their authors, as would be universally admitted in Westminster Hall; and as in the decisions of this Court of Final Appeal the Church of England is most deeply interested, she ought surely to know who is responsible for them.

It is frankly admitted that these last grounds of complaint, as being against matters of detail in procedure, are not of the same weight as those which respect matters of principle in constitution, but still they are considerable as filling up the ample measure of grievance which many faithful members of the Church of England believe the existence of this Court to inflict.

Notwithstanding the just objections which lie against this tribunal, two great difficulties stand in the way of obtaining a reform of the present system. The first difficulty is that some persons of high authority appear not only to be generally satisfied with it, but stand forth as its defenders. The second

is, that those who do desire reform are not definitely agreed as to a specific remedy.

Among the foremost champions who have appeared in defence of the present Court must be reckoned the Bishop of London and the Bishop of S. David's. The former has expressed his opinion on the matter with considerable plainness, in the volume *A Collection of the Judgments, &c.*, recently published; in a speech before the Upper House of Convocation; and in his last *Charge* (1866). The latter prelate in his last delivered *Charge* (1866), has also devoted a considerable space to the subject.

The eight reasons assigned by the Bishop of London in favour of maintaining the present Court in its integrity, have been precisely stated by himself, and may be thus briefly summed up :— (1) That it is desirable that a single Court should exist, having control over the independent judicatures of the four Archbishops, "held in the Queen's name," "with power in all provinces of the realm." (2) That the arrangement embodying the principles of the present Court was "most deliberately adopted on the recommendation" of a Royal Commission. (3) That the constitution of the Court is in accordance with the principle laid down at the Reformation for the decision of spiritual appeals. (4) That it accords with long practice. (5) That it is an improvement on the Court of Delegates. (6) That there are difficulties in substituting a better system. (7) That no plan for reconstruction has obtained the general approval of leaders of opinion. (8) And, finally, the Bishop of London affirms it as his private opinion, that no plan of judicature very different in principle from the present could be suggested which is so well fitted to secure the true object in view.

The foregoing arguments, however, upon consideration, are not wholly convincing. Reviewing them in order, it may be replied to the 1st—That the condition asserted to be so eminently desirable does not exist under the present system, as the Court of Delegates in Ireland is a totally different tribunal from the Judicial Committee of Privy Council in England, though this very patent fact, at least on the present occasion, appears not to have been present to the mind of the Right Rev. Prelate. To the 2nd—(a) That the recommendations of commissions have not invariably proved sure guarantees for wholesome legislation; and, (b) even if they had done so, that in this case at least the suggestions of this particular Commission were not only not deliberately adopted but positively contravened. To the 3rd —That it misstates an historical fact, the principle laid down at the Reformation in connexion with, and indeed in direct conse-

quence of, the Statute governing spiritual appeals being, that they should be carried to a Provincial Synod, or to a delegation of three or four Bishops. To the 4th—That some human managements which can claim the support of long practice, should beyond all question be looked upon not as examples but as warnings. To the 5th—That the assertion it contains may admit of very considerable doubt, if it may not be surely contradicted. For in the constitution of the Court of Delegates the power of selection was so wide that the most competent persons in the country might be chosen by the Crown for the decision of any particular case. Whereas now, the choice of the Lord President for the purpose of constituting a Court of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is restrained comparatively within very narrow limits. To the 6th—That the condition suggested is by no means an unusual one where improvements are called for. To the 7th—That there is consequently a proportionably larger need for careful consideration of this subject among the leaders of opinion in Church and State. To the 8th—The reply is of course obvious—It is unnecessary to say more than that opinions of at least equal weight look the other way.

The announcements of the second prominent champion of the present system, the Bishop of S. David's, not being so formally tabulated and distinctly defined as the arguments of the Bishop of London, cannot be replied to with equal precision. In truth, partaking rather of the character of disjointed expressions of private opinions, and of personal preferences, scattered broadcast about his Lordship's Charge, they have to be disinterred in order to a general review, with considerable industry, from a wide field overspread with other matter. However, when gathered up, they suggest some material for remark.

In the first place, as to the origin of the dissatisfaction with the present Court, very considerable misapprehension appears to exist in his Lordship's mind. One learns that in his opinion the late judgment *in re Essays and Reviews* "gave occasion to this movement" in opposition to the existing system of Final Ecclesiastical Appeals. But this private opinion of his Lordship is altogether wide of matter of fact. Many years before the publication of that notorious volume was even contemplated, measures were taken for the reformation of this Court, and those too of a far more impressive and decided character than any since adopted. The Bill introduced into the House of Lords for a remedy of this grievance in the year 1847, the proceedings of a Select Committee of that House on the question, the amended Bill of 1848-1849, the meetings of twenty-five out of the twenty-

eight Prelates of our two Provinces convened for the consideration of the subject in 1850, the introduction of a third Bill into the House of Lords in that year, and the remarkable debate which ensued, all this is matter of history of which the Bishop of S. David's appears to have been either uninformed, or at least to be now altogether oblivious. This is in truth no new movement. After the introduction of the present system by the unhappy legislative mistake of 1833, very speedy measures of a most imposing character were taken with a view to amendment, and though the grievance unfortunately was not then redressed, the sense of it has never for one moment since ceased most deeply to disturb thoughtful minds.

Then again it is observable that the Bishop of S. David's, at least from the mode of reasoning he adopts, seems to entertain remarkably undistinguishing notions of the broad and marked differences which exist between the powers and functions of a Court and the powers and functions of a Synod, and especially of their respective relations to each other. Indeed he unmistakably subordinates the higher jurisdiction to the lower. But for such confusion of thought it would have been quite unnecessary to remark here, that the interpretation of formularies of faith, and the construction of them, are very different engagements; and that in whatever way the Court of Final Appeal might be amended, no one has yet ever even suggested that any thing beyond the duty of interpretation should be asssigned to it. Indeed, whatever might be the event of any particular case brought under the view of such a tribunal, whether well or ill-constituted, it is clear that "the faith of the Church" would not "be at stake." Nor could "a declaration of faith," nor any "new article of faith," either more or less authoritative, be pronounced by the decision of any Court whatsoever, whether composed of laymen as in the present case, or of laymen advised by Ecclesiastics, or even of Ecclesiastics alone. The faintest perception of the most elementary distinctions on this head would have freed his Lordship's announcements from considerable and indeed needless embarrassments and ambiguities, of which space cannot here be found to divest them.

In fine, so far as can be generally gathered from the contents of this Prelate's *Charge* of 1866, the main ground for the hearty rejoicing and "deepest thankfulness" which his Lordship assures his clergy that he derives from the maintenance of the present system, rests on his individual preference for lawyers, when compared with Bishops or clergy, as judges in matters of spiritual learning. And this preference, more than once asserted, seems

but the natural consequence of his Lordship's conviction, thus unreservedly expressed in his own words, that in spiritual questions "the Divine would surely get the better of the Judge." The opposite possibility, however, of the Judge ever getting the better of the Divine is never so much as once hinted at. And so it is interesting to learn, that notwithstanding some late experiences, the Bishop of S. David's still retains a simple confidence that legal persons cannot fail to approach subjects committed to their judgment "without the slightest bias from preconceived notions." Expressions, however, of individual preference, arising from personal distrust of one body of men, and personal confidence in another, will hardly be received as convincing arguments by any one who doubts whether the distrust and confidence respectively are justly entertained.

As the Bishop of S. David's has distinctly expressed his belief that the Church of England has less to fear from the "bitterest of her enemies," than from "some of her friends," who on this subject do not coincide with his Lordship's private opinions, it is not surprising that he should contemplate without any expression of regret their departure from her bosom, pointing out indeed for their direction an alternative refuge either in the Church of Rome, or in a new Domestic Schism, for the internal government of which he considerately suggests some constitutional details. However, since the Church of England has never as yet accorded her willing assent to the constitution of the present Court of Final Appeal, or indeed to the conclusions of the Bishop of S. David's on this subject, and moreover is not likely to do so in time to come, no general defalcation from her ranks on account of this external grievance appears at all imminent. And, indeed, should there happen to be any clergyman within the jurisdiction of the see of S. David's, who is dissatisfied with the Court as now constituted, yet it is devoutly to be hoped that even he will abstain from hastily adopting either of the alternatives so thoughtfully suggested as remedies for the present distress by his own diocesan.

On the whole it may be fairly doubted whether the formal arguments of the Bishop of London, or the pronounced opinions of the Bishop of S. David's, the two foremost champions of the present system, carry with them sufficient weight to overbalance the objections attaching to it. That some emendations will eventually be made, notwithstanding the prophetic vaticinations proclaiming the hopelessness of redress which were lately addressed to the clergy of S. David's, is not improbable. That such emendations ought to be founded on principles altogether differ-

ent from those which pervade the volume entitled *A Collection of Judgments, &c.* is very certain. A system which would establish an harmonious relation between the rights and functions of the Church on the one hand, and of the State on the other—a relation most certainly not now existing—can alone secure permanent contentment.

It has been said above that difficulties stand in the way of amendment in the Final Court of Appeal, not only from the fact that some persons, high in authority as we have seen, defend the present system, but from a second fact that those who are dissatisfied with the Court are not definitely agreed on a remedy. (1) Some have urged that the Final Appeal Court in the State for the purposes under view should be composed wholly of Ecclesiastics. (2) Others that it should be a mixed Court of laymen and Ecclesiastics. (3) And again, others that it should be a Court composed of laymen only, bred to the law as at present, but assisted on all doctrinal points by Ecclesiastics. Many varieties of opinion as to detail have existed, but the several plans proposed may be generally ranged under one or other of the three heads mentioned.

The first project can in no way be regarded as attainable. The State wields the sword, directing and controlling all executive authority in last resort. With that it will not part, nor is it likely to consent that a Final Court, with jurisdiction over persons and property, should be composed of Ecclesiastics only. And if it did do so, it is by no means clear that such an arrangement would be desirable. In the case of an Established Church endowed by law, a final tribunal must have to receive appeals, not only on questions involving faith, but on questions involving law and fact. Such a Court should be fortified by all that experience in unravelling intricacies of law, and should possess all that familiarity with the application of rules of evidence to questions of fact which are only surely to be found in persons of legal education and knowledge. On these accounts a Final Court composed of Ecclesiastics alone is scarcely to be desired.

The second project, embracing the formation of a Court composed of laymen and ecclesiastics conjoined, with equal powers of judicature, appears of all plans to be the most undesirable. The legal and theological mind would ill consort, and moreover a tribunal would thus be formed for which no worthy precedent can be adduced, and which, too, from some examples of the past, may reasonably be contemplated with extreme dislike and alarm.

The third project seems to offer the fairest prospect of success; and further, it coincides more fully than any other with the received principles of our national jurisprudence. The principle *cuique in suâ arte credendum*, is interwoven with our whole legal system. When any matter comes before a Court which is presumed to require information from without for coming to a right decision, it refers for advice and guidance to those who are presumed to possess that information. Thus, in questions of foreign law, reference is made to those who are conversant with it. In questions of science, experts are consulted. In Common Law questions, arising in the Court of Chancery, issues are sent from Chancery to be tried in Common Law Courts. In the Court of Admiralty, Elder Brethren of the Trinity House, skilled in naval affairs, assist the Judge. And, to come more directly to the present subject, if a question of the Law Divine arises in a Common Law Court, it surceases from proceeding till the matter has been referred to Judgment Ecclesiastical. An analogous course is pursued in Scotland, where spiritual questions are left to the Courts of the Kirk, alone presumed competent to deal with them. The whole system, therefore, of our national jurisprudence seems to point to this solution of the difficulty, that the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, as now constituted by the general law, a purely Civil Court, composed of laymen only skilled in law, and representing the final authority of the State over persons and property, should hear causes appealed from in the Ecclesiastical Courts in final resort; but that meanwhile, when the Law Divine comes into question, the Court should seek assistance from spiritual advisers, presumed to be able to state what is or what is not the received doctrine of the Church of England on the point raised.

That such spiritual referees should not be elected *pro hâc vice*, for any particular case, must be manifest to every one. They might be a standing body of Bishops serving in rotation, or of Bishops chosen by lot, or a board elected by our two Provincial Synods at their first assembly with each new Parliament. But, however constituted, one course should be most scrupulously avoided, that of appointing persons, *pro hâc vice*, to advise in any particular case. Nor would their province be in any case whatever to construct, but only to interpret.

In no other civilized country is the system of Ecclesiastical Appeal so utterly indefensible as in England, the Appeal on a theological issue being here by the general law to a purely lay court. In no other civilized country are there grounds for complaint so just. In Russia the Final Appeal lies to the Holy

Governing Synod. In Greece to the Holy Synod. In France the Ecclesiastical Judicatures are unchallenged, except (1) they are guilty of excess of jurisdiction; or (2) violate national law; or (3) commit outrage in the exercise of their functions. Then only they are restrained by the *Appel comme d'Abus,* but under that process no right of interference is ever claimed by the Civil power in determination of doctrine. In Belgium the Appeal is solely to Ecclesiastical authority. In the United States of America, questions of doctrine are wholly confined to Ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and there is no appeal from them in such cases. The State Courts will not interfere with Ecclesiastical Judgments on matters of faith, but will only entertain an action at law in cases where private wrong is alleged, and then they do not assume the power of laying down what is or what is not the doctrine of the Church, but they decide the particular case, having respect to that doctrine as defined by those who have authority to do so. To come nearer home. In Scotland the Final Appeal in doctrinal matters arising in the Kirk is to the General Assembly—in the eyes of our northern brethren the highest Ecclesiastical authority. And indeed we may feel quite sure that their national firmness, stern sense of right, and close adherence to ancient principles of judicature, would never have permitted the jurisprudence of their country to drift into the unhappy and indefensible condition which discredits our Ecclesiastical legislation in the face of Christendom. For the truth is, that we in England have drifted into our present anomalous position unconsciously, unpremeditatedly, in such sort that all true principles of jurisprudence are violated by the existing system. Those who ought to have been keenly alive to the effects of legislative changes slumbered through the process, and only woke up too late, when the evil had been accomplished. That any should now rise up to defend a system which is a foundling begotten by an unhappy accident, may seem strange enough. But so it is, and their defence is the chief hindrance in the way of getting rid of the burden.

The Judicial Committee of Privy Council has, by force of a recent statute as above described, been entrusted with the power formerly wielded by the Court of Delegates. But though the Judicial Committee of Privy Council has succeeded to the authority, it has in no way inherited the character of that Court. That Court of Delegates for Church Appeals was in its first intention an Ecclesiastical Court. And by an Ecclesiastical Court is not here meant merely a Court wielding jurisdiction over Ecclesiastical causes, but a Court as originally conceived, and as described

in the *Reformatio Legum*, entirely composed of ecclesiastical elements—to use the words of that document—consisting "of three or four Bishops." It was in the full sense of the words, as to its intention, constitution, mode of proceeding, and action, an Ecclesiastical Court. And even if, through misapprehension of its original constitution, laymen sat with Ecclesiastics in after years on that tribunal, it yet maintained its character for the purposes under our view as an Ecclesiastical Court. But the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, not having one single Ecclesiastic by the general law among its members, is not in any sense an Ecclesiastical Court. It is wholly impossible to deem it such without perversion of thought, or to call it such except by misapplication of language. In the true sense of the terms, the Court of Delegates—however differently constituted in later times from the original intention of its founders—was not a Civil but an Ecclesiastical Court. In the true sense of the terms, the Judicial Committee of Privy Council is not an Ecclesiastical but a Civil Court. And so, by the blundering legislation of 1832—1833, Final Appeals, involving questions of faith and doctrine, were transferred from an Ecclesiastical to a Civil Judicature. Without observation, without intention, a violence was done to the fundamental principles of our national jurisprudence, and to the legal traditions of Universal Christendom.

Between the year 1534 and the year 1832, the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction did not here end with the Archbishops' Courts. There was an Ecclesiastical Court superior to theirs—the Court of Delegates. Since 1833 the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, properly so called, ends with the Archbishops' Courts, whence there is by statute a regular Appeal to a Civil Court, the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, on questions of faith and doctrine. That is the present position: and that is a solœcism in Jurisprudence for which the world's past history can supply no precedent, and for which it is devoutly to be hoped its future annals will furnish no fresh example. While English Churchmen complain, English Statesmen may well blush.

A Magistrate.

The Ritual Law of the Church of England.

Perhaps no subject has more engaged the attention of Churchmen during the past year than that of Ritual, or the proper mode of conducting the Service of the Most High. It is difficult to understand how any one can doubt that this is a very serious question, requiring from us all very grave consideration, and involving issues of deep importance. A Churchman would naturally ask himself—Is there, or is there not, a Divine Law prescribing a Liturgy by which men may approach God in worship?

The devout student of Holy Scripture can hardly fail at once to acknowledge, that Christ did provide a Liturgy, which He designed to be continually celebrated by Priests of His own appointment; and he may reasonably believe that He meant it to be accompanied with an ornate and splendid Ritual. For, the essence of that Liturgy he will find stated in the Gospels; while, as to its ceremonial accessories, he may discern their pattern in the glorious Vision vouchsafed to S. John the Divine, to whom was depicted the gorgeous sanctuary of the Church Universal, embracing within its eternal boundaries the Heaven, the earth, and the regions under the earth, from whence he heard in melodious strains the grand hymn of praise and adoration, emanating from thousands, and thousands of thousands, of prostrate men and Angels exclaiming, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever" (Rev. v. 13). As God "showed" to Moses while "in the Mount" the patterns of the "worldly sanctuary," so did He in like manner, after the dissolution of the Jewish polity, "show" to the last surviving Apostle the "pattern" of that true Tabernacle, that general Form of Divine Worship, together with the "Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof," which God deemed fitting for His own glory and man's edification.

Now, in these patterns of Heavenly things, the following features are to be carefully noted:—1. the Altar; 2. the Sacrifice—"the Lamb as it had been slain;" 3. the Adoration of the Lamb; 4. the Incense offered to the Lamb, typical of adoration, by the twenty-four Presbyters of the Sanctuary; 5. the Incense offered by the Angel on the Golden Altar, symbolical of the

Merits of CHRIST; 6. Instrumental and Vocal Music, in honour of the LAMB; 7. the Seven Lamps of Fire burning before the Throne, in the presence of a light more brilliant than that of the sun in its meridian; and 8. the Vestments of the Angelic Ministry of white and gold. A pious and reflecting Christian may well ask himself—Was this august Vision, vouchsafed to the Beloved Apostle, similar in essence and object to that showed to Moses in the Mount? The Catholic Church, both East and West, by her present practice, and that of every age, up to the Apostolic era, has answered this question, in the affirmative.

The Church of England has likewise delivered the same response, though it must be confessed that her practice of late years has been far from the Divine intention. It is the purpose of this Essay to show, that notwithstanding her many shortcomings, the result of causes beyond her control, she has made ample provision for carrying out a Ceremonial which was not dissimilar to that shown by GOD in the last of the Canonical Books of Holy Scripture, and which has at all times been carefully observed by the Church Universal.

That a considerable number of Priests and people have become conscious of a great falling away from the Apocalyptic form of Divine Worship, and that efforts have been made to promote a restoration of the ancient Catholic Ceremonial, is patent to all. Whether this movement will be ultimately successful, is known only to GOD; every thing will of course depend upon the temper with which it will be received by the people of this country. The horror, the insane horror, with which they regard as "Popery" almost every Catholic dogma, is indeed a serious impediment to the free course of Divine truth. But the English are, notwithstanding, a sensible people; and in due time, if we are patient and loving, they will doubtless learn to separate truth from error; and so also to distinguish that true ideal of Catholic worship which emanated from the Divine mind, from that Protestant perversion of it which is the result of the carnal and self-willed mind of man.

It is naturally to be expected that the so-called "Ritual Movement" will meet with opposition even from members of the Hierarchy; and therefore we must not be surprised at efforts being made to prove the illegality of the many usages now restored, and at attempts to put down by force their continuance in our Churches. With a view to this object, and also to the general investigation of the whole question of Ritual, there have been published in the course of the past year four Documents: 1. The Opinion of Sir Roundell Palmer and three other learned

Counsel on "The Ornaments of the Minister;" 2. "The Report" of the Lower House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury "on Ritual," and the Judgment of both Houses thereon; 3. The Opinion of the nine eminent Counsel on "Disputed Ritual Ornaments and Usages;" and 4. The Report of the English Church Union.

The Report of the Lower House of Convocation is indeed a weighty Document, inasmuch as it is the deliberate judgment of the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled. Its importance is greatly enhanced from the circumstance that throughout the whole Province, and we might add the other Provinces both in England and Ireland, not one single word of remonstrance has been addressed to the House which adopted it; and, so far as we know, no Dean, Archdeacon, or Proctor has been called to account for any share he has had in the adoption of this Report. Indeed, if the Church of England has spoken at all on this subject, it has obviously done so rather in the affirmative than otherwise; for without intending to adopt all the minutiæ of Ritual, a considerable body of the Clergy, and an overwhelming number of not merely nominal Churchmen (much less Dissenters) but of *Communicants* to the extent of some 40,000, addressed a Memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury, deprecating any alteration in the Rubric relating "to the Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof." This alone is a significant fact, which the opponents of Church Ritual have been as yet unable to gainsay, much less to neutralize, by presenting a counter-memorial signed by a similar number of persons who are Communicants. This Memorial then marks an epoch in the history of the Church of England, and is a solemn protest on the part of those who have most right to speak—the Communicants of the Church—against any alteration being made in the Law of Ritual.

It is true that the Bishops in their Resolution on Ritual, adopted upon the 13th of February last, have delivered their Judgment upon the Report of the Lower House to this effect, "that no alterations from long-sanctioned and usual Ritual ought to be made in our Churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese has been obtained thereto." But this amounts inferentially to a sanction of the use of the Ornaments and Ritual as approved by the Report, if no "diversity" exists in Congregations respecting it; for, as the Bishops admit, they can deliver and enforce no order that is "contrary to any thing contained in this Book." The Upper House, then, has to all intents and purposes confirmed the Report and Judgment of the Lower

House, which expressed its approval in the abstract of the use of Lights, Vestments, and Incense.

With these preliminary remarks, we now proceed to investigate the "Law of Ritual" from the period of the Reformation to the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer. We shall not be deterred by any notions of expediency from stating what we believe to be the full, unadulterated, legal, and Canonical truth in these matters, for what we have to do is, honestly and without regard to consequences, to examine the Canon Law of the Church, and the Law of the Realm respecting the changes that were successively made in the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries. It is necessary to discuss the nature of these alterations, in order that we may have accurate data for testing the soundness of the conclusions which the Convocation of Canterbury, the four Counsel of certain Archbishops and Bishops, and the nine Counsel of the English Church Union arrived at on the various points of Ritual submitted for their consideration and judgment. It is very true that modern customs are not favourable to the so-called 'Ritualist;' but there are, we think, reasons which may be adduced to show that the ordinary practice of the Church of England during the last three centuries is worthless as an *authority* for guidance in matters of Ritual.

The influence exercised by certain foreign Protestants, especially in the reign of King Edward VI., was any thing but beneficial to the Church of England, either in matters of Doctrine or of Ritual. The opinions and habits of these men were alien, not perhaps to a large portion of the Commonalty, but to the Law and Custom of the Reformed Church of England. They desired that the Church should conform, both in Doctrine and Usage, to a foreign Protestant standard, rather than to the good old laws and customs of the Church of England, which were co-eval with Christianity. These foreigners and their followers in this country successfully opposed the Canonical and Legal standard of the Church of England, and by the mere force of numbers established customs which, upon a comparison, are irreconcilable with the requirements of the Book of Common Prayer and the Canon Law of the Church.

The several Acts of Uniformity, the Injunctions, and other Royal Proclamations witness to the lawlessness of these pseudo-Churchmen. The Act 2 and 3 Edward VI. c. 1, complains not merely of the "divers forms of Common Prayer" which prevailed in different Dioceses, but of the "divers and sundry forms and fashions [that] have been used in the cathedral and parish churches of England and Wales," both as regards Matins, Evensong, and

the Holy Communion, "commonly called the Mass;" some refusing to use the old Rites and Ceremonies, so that the King at "divers times assayed to stay innovations or new rites," but was unsuccessful. The next Act of Uniformity, the 5 and 6 Edward VI. c. 1, complains of "a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality, and living either without knowledge or due fear of God, do wilfully and damnably before Almighty God abstain and refuse" to attend Divine Service.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, this rebellious opposition to the Book of Common Prayer and the usages thereof was prevalent. In the Royal Injunctions of 1559, the Queen commands her subjects "to forbear all vain and contentious disputations in matters of religion, and not to use in despite or rebuke of any person, these convicious words, papist or papastical heretic, schismatic, or sacramentary, any such like words of reproach" (Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol i. p. 229).

In A.D. 1566, Archbishop Parker, in a letter to the Bishop of London, complains of a want of "conformitie, in administration of public Prayers and Sacraments, and in outward apparell;" the neglect of which the Archbishop declared to be a "manifest violation and contempte of the Queen's Majesties authoritie" (*Ibid.* pp. 334, 335). Three years after, the Council, in a letter to the Archbishop, complained of the decay of discipline, and that in consequence "no small number of her subjects, partly for lack of diligent teaching and information, partly for lack of correction and reformation, are entered either into dangerous errors . . . without use or exercise of any rite of the Church, openly forbearing to resort to their parish churches." The Council looked to the Bishops to enforce discipline, and it evidently implies that some of them were remiss in their duty (*Ibid.* pp. 350, 351).

In A.D. 1573 the Queen issued "a proclamation against the despisers or breakers of the orders prescribed" in the Prayer Book, in which she declares "the cause of which disorders . . . to be the negligence of the Bishops and other magistrates, who should cause the good laws and Acts of Parliament made in this behalf to be better executed, and not so dissembled and winked at, as hitherto (it may appear) that they have been." The Queen then commands them "to put in execution the Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, and the Administration of the Sacraments, made in the first year of her gracious reign, with all diligence and severity" (*Ibid.* 384, 385). In 1604, King James I. published a proclamation to the same effect, "enjoining

conformity to the form of the service of God established" (*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 80). This was almost immediately followed by a letter from the Council desiring proceedings to be taken "against the non-conformitans of the clergy" (*Ibid.* p. 88). In the next reign commenced, as we all know, the Great Rebellion, the active agents of which were composed of Independents and other Non-conformists, who did not scruple to behead both the Primate of all England and the King, and to subvert the Constitution, substituting in its place an iron and exacting despotism.

When King Charles II. was restored, and with him the Constitution in Church and State, another Act of Uniformity was passed, in which, after reciting the original establishment of the Book of Common Prayer, there occurs the following declaration—That "notwithstanding, a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own sensuality, and living without knowledge and due fear of God, do wilfully and schismatically abstain and refuse to come to the parish churches . . . and [that] by the great and scandalous neglect of ministers in using the said order or liturgy so set forth and enjoined as aforesaid, great mischiefs and inconveniences during the times of the late unhappy troubles, have arisen and grown." The next reign witnessed the Revolution, when a foreign Protestant mounted the Catholic throne of England; and not many years after, the House of Brunswick, deeply tinged with foreign Protestantism, succeeded and established its dynasty in this country. It is fair then to ask, What is the value of the Ecclesiastical Customs and Usages of the last three Centuries?

The whole history of the Church of England during this period is one (so far as our subject is concerned) of rebellion against her Laws and ancient Usages. Many of the Bishops were so careless that they did not enforce conformity. A large body of the Priests were so negligent that they allowed the Ritual and Ceremonial of the Church to fall into desuetude. So scandalous was this state of things, that Elizabeth, James, and Charles constantly complained of the innovations that were so common, calling upon the Bishops, and even commanding them, to do their duty in enforcing uniformity according to law. The history of the Church is a painful one, exhibiting too plainly the lawless and anarchical spirit that had taken possession of all orders and degrees of men, which has well-nigh brought her to ruin, and would have done so long ago had it not been for the almost miraculous interposition of Providence, Who willed not her destruction. We repeat, then, that the prevailing Customs, regarding Ritual, of the present age and of the last three cen-

turies, as matter of authority for determining or explaining the real mind of the Church in this respect, are absolutely worthless, being founded on innovations of the worst description, promoted and established by those whose whole aim and object was the subversion of the Catholic Faith.

But during this long reign of anarchy and non-conformity, the Church has on several occasions protested against the contumacious and wicked violation of her laws, and in the time of King James she boldly declared that it was far from her purpose "to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the *Apology of the Church of England* confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those Ceremonies, which doth neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders" (30th Canon 1603). Such was the deliberate protest of the Church of England against the Puritan innovations of the seventeenth Century. Such is her protest still.

We now proceed to the main part of our inquiry, and we cannot do better than commence our argument by laying down three positions which we regard as essential to a right comprehension of the whole question of Ritual Worship.

The positions we would affirm are these :—

I. That the Church of England, both before and after the Reformation, is the same identical Church—the same body corporate, retaining absolutely the same form of government, the same constitution, the same Creeds, the same Canon Law, excepting only such portions of it as have been repealed, or have become inconsistent with existing laws. If it be held that the post-Reformation Church is, like the Kirk of Scotland, a new Religious Society, then it must be conceded that she has no concern whatever with the Mediæval or Primitive Church, and consequently has no continuity in Orders, or in Doctrine, or Discipline; and it must be further admitted that the ancient Canon Law has no place in the jurisprudence of the Church of England. Very few educated Churchmen, however, would entertain such an idea, as that the Church of England is a new Church of the sixteenth century; for all Churchmen hold the Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, which the Church of England could not, under the circumstances of the last three centuries, possibly

possess except through the Mediæval Church. Our first position then must stand good, that the Mediæval, together with the Primitive Church, and the modern English Church are identically the same in succession, in form of government, in Orders, and in Law.

II. That unless any formal Canon, Statute, or Ordinance can be produced, abolishing, modifying, or reforming the ancient Ecclesiastical law—whether canonical or statutory—it is still existing in full force at this day.

III. That no Customs or Usages introduced in modern times, not being expressly sanctioned by law, can be held to repeal or modify or render legally obsolete any of those ancient Customs or Usages which had been practised time out of mind in the Church of England.

These three positions, which are unassailable as respects the Civil and Common Law of the Realm, we hold to be equally unassailable when applied to the principles of the Ecclesiastical and Canon Law and Usages of the Church. Having now established our basis of operation, we proceed to consider the changes that were made in the reigns of King Henry VIII. and successive monarchs, down to the period of the last revision of the Prayer Book.

I. The following are the Acts of Parliament which enabled Henry VIII. and Edward VI. to exercise power in reforming real or alleged abuses in the Church.

1. 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1, which empowered the King "to visit repress redress reform order correct restrain and amend all such Errors Heresies Abuses Offences Contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any Manner spiritual Authority or Jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed repressed &c. most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the Increase of Virtue in Christ's Religion, &c. any Usage Custom foreign Laws foreign Authority prescription or other Thing or Things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."

2. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 26, which enacted that all "Decrees and Ordinances which, according to God's Word and Christ's Gospel, by the King's advice and confirmation by his Letters Patents, shall be made and ordained by the Archbishops, Bishops and Doctors appointed, or to be appointed, in and upon the matter of Christian Religion and Christian Faith, and the lawful Rites Ceremonies and observations of the same, shall be in every point thereof believed obeyed and performed to all intents and purposes, upon the pains therein comprised. Provided, that

nothing such be ordained or desired, which shall be repugnant to the Laws and Statutes of this Realm."

The above Acts are the sources from whence the King derived authority and power to reform and redress all abuses in the Church of England.

(1) The following were the changes effected by Henry VIII.: ". . . They shall not set forth or extol any images, reliques, or miracles, for any superstition or lucre;" nor shall the Clergy "allure the people by any inticements to the pilgrimages of any Saint, otherwise than is permitted in the Articles lately put forth by the authority of the King's Majesty, and condescended upon by the prelates and clergy of this his realm in Convocation" (Burnet's *Reformation*, vol. i. *Records*, p. 161, quoted from Perry's *Lawful Church Ornaments*, p. 14, London, 1857).

(2) This was followed two years later by other Injunctions, wherein the King ordered a Bible "to be provided for every parish church, at the joint charge of the parson and parishioners. No person was to be discouraged from reading or hearing the scriptures, but, on the contrary, exhorted to improve themselves from thence. Every Sunday and Holyday the parson was to repeat a sentence out of the LORD'S Prayer or Creed, in English, till the people had learnt the whole by heart; and at the confession of penitence in Lent, they were to examine them upon these heads, and not to admit them to the Holy Communion till they came up to expectation. The Clergy were likewise ordered to remove such images as had been superstitiously applied to pilgrimages and offerings, or treated with over proportioned regard. To this purpose they were not to suffer any candles or tapers to be set before any image, but only the Light by the Rood-loft, the Light before the Sacrament of the Altar, and the Light about the Sepulchre: these were allowed to stand for the ornamenting of the Church, and the solemnity of Divine Service" (Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol iv. pp. 422, 423, London, 1845).

(3) "Forasmuch as you, as well in your own name, and in the name of the Bishops of Worcester and Chichester, and other our chaplains and learned men, whom we appointed with you to peruse certain books of service which we delivered unto you; moved us that the vigil, and ringing of bells all the night long upon Allhallows-day at night, and the covering of images in the churches in the time of Lent; with the lifting up of the veil that covereth the Cross upon Palm Sunday, with the kneeling to the Cross the same time, might be abolished and put away for the superstition, and other enormities and abuses of the same. . . . Forasmuch as that vigil is abused, as other vigils were; our

pleasure is as you require, that the said vigil shall be abolished as the other be [*i. e.* 'vigils of our Lady and the Apostles,' which had been abolished many years before], and that there shall be no watching or ringing but as be commonly used upon other Holydays at night. We be contented and pleased, also, that the images in the churches shall not be covered as hath been accustomed in times past, or no veil upon the Cross, or kneeling thereto upon Palm Sunday, nor any other time. And forasmuch as you make no mention of creeping to the Cross, which is a greater abuse than any other . . . . Therefore our pleasure is, that the said creeping to the Cross shall likewise cease from henceforth, and be abolished, with other the abuses before rehearsed," &c. (King's *Letter to Archbishop Cranmer, Ibid.* vol. v. pp. 136, 137).

(4) Besides these, there were several Episcopal Injunctions issued, which were in accordance with those of the King. Edward Lee, Archbishop of York in 1536, issued the following: "All Curates, havinge charge of any Congregacion, must diligentlie informe their flocke, according to the King's Highnes Injunctions, that they may in no wise yelde Worshippe to any Images, lowtinge or bowing downe, or knelinge to the said Images, ne offering to them any Money, or Wax lighte or unlighte, or any oder thing: For so muche as Offeringe is to be made to God onlie, and to no Creature under God. Neverthelesse they may still use Lightes in the Roode Lofete, and afore the Sacrament, and at the Sepulchre at Easter; accordinge to the King's Injunctions: so that they none use to the honeer or worshippe of any Image, ne by the way of offeringe made, odre to any Image, or to any Sainct represented by the same. . . . Alle suche Ymages, to whiche any manner of Resorte is usede, by way of Peregrenage or Offeringe, they must depose and sequestre from all Sighte of Men, and suffre them no more to be sett upp" (Burnet's *Reformation,* vol. iii. *Records,* pt. 3. Bk. 3. p. 137, from Perry's *Lawful Ornaments,* pp. 14, 15).

Bishop Shaxton, of Sarum, in an Injunction published in 1538, thus directed:—"That ye suffre no Night-watches in your Churches and Chappells, neither decking of Ymages with Gold, Silver, Clothes, Lights, or Herbs; nor the people knele to them, nor worship them, nor offre Candles, Otes, Cake-Breed, Chese, Wolle, or any such other thinges to them; But he [*i. e.* the Curate] shall instruct and teach them, how they ought and may use them; that is to say, only to beholde, or loke upon them, as one loketh upon a Boke. . . . For otherwise there might be peril of ydolatrie, especially of ignorant lay-people, if they either in

hert, or outward gesture worship them, or give honour to them, which ought onlie to be given to GOD, the LORD of all Saintes." The Bishop then proceeds to condemn "idle pilgrimage," and "reliques," such as "stinking bootes, mucky combes, ragged rochettes, rotten girdles, . . . and such pelfrie beyond estimacion; over and besides the shamefull abuse of such as peradventure be true reliques in dede" (*Ibid.* pp. 144—147, from Perry's *Lawful Ornaments*, pp. 17, 18). Upon the accession of Edward VI. the changes ordered by King Henry were confirmed and enlarged.

(5) The Clergy were forbidden to "set forth or extol any images, relics, or miracles, for any superstition or lucre."

(6) "Wandering to pilgrimages, offering of money, candles, or tapers, to relics, or images, or kissing and licking of the same, praying upon beads, or such like superstition," were forbidden.

(7) They were ordered to remove and destroy all such images as "be or have been so abused with pilgrimage or offerings of any thing made thereunto, or shall be hereafter censed unto;" and it was further ordered that "henceforth no torches nor candles, tapers or images of wax" should "be set afore any image or picture, but only two Lights upon the High Altar, before the Sacraments, which, for the signification that CHRIST is the very true Light of the world, they shall suffer to remain still."

(8) It was ordered that the Bible "in English," and the "'Paraphrasis' of Erasmus also in English upon the Gospels" should be "set up in some convenient place" in the Church.

(9) Also that "the Epistle and Gospel," "in the time of High Mass," should be read "in English and not in Latin."

(10) Litany "procession about the church or churchyard, or other place" was forbidden; but it was ordered that "the Priests with other of the quire shall kneel in the midst of the church, and sing or say plainly and distinctly the Litany which is set forth in English," and "immediately before Mass."

(11) It was ordered that "in the time of the Litany, of the High Mass, of the Sermon, and when the Priest readeth the Scripture . . . all ringing and knolling of bells, . . . except one bell in convenient time to be rung or knolled before the sermon," was to cease.

(12) It was further ordered that the Clergy should "take away, utterly extinct and destroy all shrines, covering of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindles or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition: so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches or houses" (Cardwell's *Doc. Ann.* vol. i. pp. 5—17).

(13) In the same year an Act was passed "against such

persons as shall unreverently speak against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, commonly called the Sacrament of the Altar, and for the Receiving thereof in both Kinds" (*Statutes at Large*).

(14) It was further ordered by "the King's majesty's council . . . that no candles should be borne upon Candlemas-day, nor also from henceforth ashes or palms used any longer" (Cardwell's *Doc. Ann.* p. 46).

The changes and reforms effected during the reign of these two Kings—Henry VIII. and Edward VI.—until the issue of the First Book of 1549, may be thus tabulated :—

I. Ornaments and Usages abolished :—
   1. Images, reliques, miracles, pilgrimages; offerings to them of money, candles, or tapers; the censing of images, kissing and licking the same; shrines, covering of shrines, tables, candlesticks, trindles or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all monuments superstitiously used.
   2. Images to be no longer covered; or decked with gold, silver, clothes, lights, &c.; no kneeling to them, nor worshipping them.
   3. The Cross not to be veiled; no kneeling thereto upon Palm Sunday or at other times; no creeping to the Cross.
   4. Vigil of All-Hallows', watchings or ringing at night.
   5. Processions in Church and Church-yard.
   6. Candles on Candlemas Day.
   7. Ashes on Ash Wednesday.
   8. Palms on Palm Sunday.

II. Ornaments and Usages *specially* preserved :—
   1. Light by or on the Rood-Loft.
   2. Light before the Sacrament of the Altar.
   3. Two Lights on the High Altar before the Sacrament.
   4. Lights about the Sepulchre at Easter.
   5. Images to be used "as one loketh upon a boke."
   6. Holy Water for the stoupe at church doors.

III. Reforms ordered :—
   1. Bible in English, of the largest size, to be provided.
   2. Paraphrasis of Erasmus, in English.
   3. The Epistle and Gospel at High Mass to be read in English.
   4. The Litany in English to be sung or said in the midst of the Church "immediately before High Mass."
   5. The Sacrament to be received under both Kinds.

Such were the changes and reforms effected; but as regards the Public Service of the Church, the Ritual and Ceremonial, all, excepting such as were expressly abrogated, continued in full force until at least the close of the second year of King Edward VI. Vestments, the two Lights on the Altar, and Incense, and variety of other Usages were in canonical practice up to that period. This is plain from the Injunctions of 1547 above quoted, which orders that the Clergy shall "instruct and teach in their cures, that no man ought obstinately and maliciously to break and violate the laudable ceremonies of the Church, by the King commanded to be observed, and as yet not abrogated;" and in a proclamation published in the same year, it was therein commanded "that no manner of person, of what estate, order, or degree soever he be, of his private mind, will, or fantasy do omit, leave done, change, alter or innovate any order, rite or ceremony commonly used and frequented in the Church of England, and not commanded to be left done at any time, in the reign of our late Sovereign Lord, his Highnes' father, other than such as his Highnes, by the advice aforesaid, by his Majesty's visitors, injunctions, statutes, or proclamations hath already or hereafter shall command to be omitted, left, innovated, or changed; but that they be observed after that sort, as before they were accustomed or else now sith prescribed by the authority of his Majesty" (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* vol. i. pp. 43, 44). Again, in a letter from the Council, A.D. 1548, "What is abolished, taken away, reformed, and commanded, it is easy to see by the Acts of Parliament, the Injunctions, Proclamations, and Homilies; the which things most earnestly it behoveth all preachers in their sermons to confirm and approve accordingly; in other things, which be not yet touched, it behoveth him to think that either the prince doth allow them, or else suffer them" (*Ibid.* pp. 65, 66). It is abundantly clear, then, that all the Ornaments, Ceremonies, and Usages of the Church which had not been specially abrogated, were in full canonical and legal force until the close of the second year of Edward VI.

It is maintained, however, by some lawyers of eminence, that the Acts which empowered the King to issue Injunctions or Proclamations having the force of law were repealed by the 1 Ed. VI. c. 12, s. 3; if so, then the prohibitions contained in those Documents were also repealed, and consequently the ancient Usages which had been forbidden were revived, such as the use of candles at Candlemas, palms on Palm-Sunday, and ashes on Ash-Wednesday. This is an unfortunate argument for our opponents to advance, for unquestionably, according to the rule of law, if

a law which repealed former statutes, ordinances, or customs is itself unconditionally repealed, they are immediately revived and become effectual in law.

We have entered somewhat into detail on this part of our subject, because we thought it essential to show how few were the changes made in the Ritual and Ceremonial of the Church of England from the time of the rejection of the Roman Supremacy until the issue of the First Prayer Book of 1549, which came into use in the beginning of the third year of the King.

II. The First Book of Edward VI. A.D. 1549. It is to be remarked that in the contents of this Book no very essential departures were made from the form and structure of the ancient Breviaries and Missals. The object, as professed in the Preface "of Ceremonies," was not change or innovation, but reform and simplification: "Then such men granting some Ceremonies convenient to be had, surely where the old may be well-used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reverence unto them for their antiquity, if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord, than of innovations and new-fangleness, which . . . . is always to be eschewed. Furthermore, such shall have no just cause with the Ceremonies reserved to be offended. For as those be taken away which were most abused, and did burden men's consciences without any cause; so the other that remain, are retained for a Discipline and Order, which (upon just causes) may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with GOD'S Law. And moreover, they be neither dark nor dumb Ceremonies, but are so set forth, that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve."

The above shows clearly enough that the object of the Reformers was not to invent new Services, or to introduce "innovation and new-fangleness," which they held were "always to be eschewed;" but to reform the old Offices, and to remove therefrom what they considered were "dark and dumb Ceremonies." Accordingly, when we compare the pre-Reformation Breviaries and Missals, with the Matins, Evensong, and the Liturgy as contained in the First Prayer Book of 1549, we find the same general arrangement prevailing among all; so much so, that the Reformed Use, and the Ancient Uses are identical in form and structure, and for the most part in prayers, *minus* certain alleged Roman peculiarities.

In modern, as well as in all the ancient, Offices, we find that Matins and Evensong commence with the *Pater-noster*, followed by Versicles and the *Gloria*. The initiatory Psalm, now limited to the *Venite* at Matins (except on Easter-Day) the Psalter, now ordered to be said regularly through in course, and to be followed by a Lesson from the Old Tesment; then the *Te Deum* or *Benedicite* at Matins, the *Magnificat* or *Cantate Domino* at Evensong: succeeded by a Lesson from the New Testament: then *Benedictus* or *Jubilate*, at Matins, and *Nunc Dimittis* or *Deus Misereatur*, at Evensong: the Creed, *Dominus Vobiscum*, *Kyrie*, *Paternoster*, Suffrages, Collects and Prayers, Benediction.

The great difference between the old and new Offices is this, that in the Reformed Use, Matins, Prime and Lauds are united in one Office, under the name of Matins; and Vespers and Compline under that of Evensong.

The Liturgy, according to the First Book of 1549, will be found to be, in all essential points, identically the same in general arrangement with the former Uses. The following table will illustrate this :—

Sarum Missal.	Anglican Use of 1549.
	Lord's Prayer
Collect for Purity	Collect for Purity
Introit	Introit
Lord's Prayer	
Ave Maria	
Confession and Absolution	
Versicles	
Kiss of Peace	
Prayer of Deprecation	
Blessing of Incense	
Kyrie Eleison	Kyrie Eleison
Gloria in Excelsis	Gloria in Excelsis
Dominus Vobiscum	Dominus Vobiscum
Collects	Collects
Epistle	Epistle
Gradual	
Gloria	Gloria
Holy Gospel	Holy Gospel
Creed	Creed
Dominus Vobiscum	Exhortations
Offertory	Offertory
Preparatory Prayers	

Dominus Vobiscum	Dominus Vobiscum
Sursum Corda	Sursum Corda
Preface	Preface (abridged)
Sanctus and Benedictus	Sanctus and Benedictus
(*Then follows the Canon*)	(*Then follows the Canon*)
Prayer for the Church	Prayer for the Church
Commemoration of the Living	Commemoration of the Living
Commemoration of the Saints	Commemoration of the Saints and of the Dead
Consecration	Consecration
Oblation	Oblation
Commemoration of the Dead	
Lord's Prayer [cum	Lord's Prayer [cum
Pax Domini sit semper Vobis-	Pax Domini sit semper Vobis-
	Christ our Paschal Lamb
	Confession and Absolution
	Comfortable Words
	Prayer of Humble Access
	Communion
Agnus Dei	Agnus Dei
Pax	
Communion	
Dominus Vobiscum	Dominus Vobiscum
Post-Communion	Post-Communion
Dominus Vobiscum	
Dismissal	Dismissal

The above comparison illustrates demonstratively how slight were the changes made in the Liturgy of the Church of England. The same order, method, arrangement were strictly preserved in the new Use. In point of fact the Liturgy of 1549 was little more than a revision of all the ancient Uses, with the view of having one uniform Use for the whole Kingdom, instead of a diversity of forms, which, though all agreeing in general feature, were nevertheless inconvenient, and dangerous to unity of worship. If what we have stated is correct, it is to be presumed, in the absence of any law or canon to the contrary, that the ornaments and usages which were *common* to all the "Uses," such as the two Lighted Candles during the Celebration, the Vestments of the Officiating Ministers, the Incense, the Cross, or Crucifix, the Mixed Chalice, and all other Ornaments and Usages not inconsistent with the Reformed Liturgy, would, as a matter of course, be continued. Martin Bucer, in a letter to Hooper about A.D. 1550, admits that the Vestments were

worn (which he, indeed, defends on grounds of expediency) and that "the LORD'S Supper in many places [was] celebrated as a Mass, from which the people know not that it any thing differeth, but that it is used in the mother tongue" (Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 457). "Even under Ridley, who was now Bishop, the Communion was celebrated with such superstitions, as though it were a Mass, of this some informed the Council, and that when the Eucharist was celebrated, it was in effect a Mass. Whereupon the Council thought fit to appoint certain intelligent persons, favourers of the Gospel, to go to Paul's, and there to observe well what deviations were made from the late Order prescribed. For on the 11th of October, 1550, it was ordered, that Thomas Astely join with two or three more honest gentlemen in London, for the observation of the usages of the Communion in Paul's; whereof information was given, that it was used as the very Mass. Such a secret goodwill did many of the Priests and churchmen belonging to the Cathedral still bear to the old former usages" (*Ibid.* vol. ii. pt. i. p. 372). It was only natural that the Usages which were common to all the Uses, should be retained under the First Book, and practised by the Clergy, unless they were prohibited.

We will now proceed to show what alterations were formally made in the Public Service by the Reformed Use. These are stated expressly in the Preface to the First Prayer Book, and may be thus summarized:—

(1) The abolition of "Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things, as did break the continual course of the reading of the Scripture," as for instance, as stated in the second paragraph of the Preface, "uncertain Stories, Legends, Responds, Verses, vain Repetitions, Commemorations, and Synodals," which interfered with the continual course of the reading of Holy Scripture.

(2) The abolition of a variety of Uses, and their reduction to one Use, called "the Use of the Church of England."

(3) Amendments or reforms effected are thus stated to be (*a*) the reading of "all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) . . . once in the year:" (*b*) the saying of Divine Service in English: (*c*) the reading of the Psalter through once a month.

These are all the omissions and reforms in Ritual and Usages in the First Book of Common Prayer. There is no Canon, Law, or Ordinance, so far as we know, which in any way limits the liberty of using the ancient Ceremonial of the Church, beyond what is stated in the said Book of Common Prayer. It follows, then, according to the rule of Law, that the Ornaments

and Usages of the Church, except what were laid aside as "dark and dumb," continued in full force.

It is however said, that because certain Ornaments and Usages are not specified in the First Reformed Prayer Book, therefore they became obsolete. Now this proves too much, as we shall presently show.

In "the Supper of the LORD, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," directions are given respecting the Vestments of the Celebrating Priest, and his Assistants, but nothing is said about the arrangements of the Altar. For instance—

(1) It had always been usual to have a "fair Linen Cloth" upon the Altar at the time of Communion. No direction is given in the Rubrics for this necessary Ornament. Was it legal, then, to use this Ornament of the Church?

(2) No directions are given in the Canon for the Manual Acts of the Priest, except that he shall take the Bread and the Cup "into his hands," but it is an essential Act according to the Institution, to *break* the Bread, and to bless It and the Cup. Was it an illegal act for the Priest to do, in these respects, as he had been accustomed to do aforetime?

(3) In the Second Book the rubric ordering the "Glory be to Thee, O LORD," to be said or sung before the Holy Gospel, was omitted. Was it unlawful to continue this anthem?

If not, it follows then as a necessary conclusion that the First Prayer Book did not profess to give directions on all points relating to "the Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof," and the Usages connected therewith.

Indeed, this point is admitted in the judgment of the Judicial Committee in 'Liddell *v.* Westerton,' wherein it is stated—"Their lordships entirely agree with the opinions expressed by the learned judges in these cases, and in 'Faulkner *v.* Litchfield,' that in the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; that no omission and no addition can be permitted; but they are not prepared to hold that the use of all articles not expressly mentioned in the Rubric, although quite consistent with, and even subsidiary to the service, is forbidden. Organs are not mentioned, yet because they are auxiliary to the singing, they are allowed. Pews, cushions to kneel upon, pulpit-cloths, hassocks, seats by the Communion Table, are in constant use, yet they are not mentioned in the Rubric" (*Ecclesiastical Judgments*, p. 153. London 1865). The argument, then, founded on mere omission of direction, cannot be sustained.

If the use of a Linen Altar Cloth during Celebration, and the

Manual Acts in the Canon, though not mentioned in the Rubrics of the first Prayer Book, were legal, then it follows that all those Ornaments and Usages which had not been authoritatively forbidden, such as the Altar, the Vestments, the Candlesticks for the Two Lights, the Censer for the Incense, were perfectly lawful under the First Prayer Book.

There is, however, a clause in the Act of Uniformity of 2 and 3 Edward VI. which seems to favour the view of those who deny the lawfulness of such Ornaments and their Usages as are omitted in the Rubric of the Prayer Book.

The Statute orders that the Clergy shall say Matins and Evensong and the Holy Communion "in such Order and Form as is mentioned in the same Book, and none other or otherwise." And it imposes penalties on all who shall "refuse to use the said Common Prayers, &c. in such Order and Form as they be mentioned and set forth in the said Book; or shall use, wilfully and obstinately standing in the same, any other Rite, Ceremony, Order, Form, or Manner of Mass . . . than is mentioned and set forth in the said Book." But it must be observed that the Act had two purposes in view (1) to reduce all the Canonical uses into one: and (2) to restrain all persons who were desirous of innovating upon the ancient Usages. The words "Rite, Ceremony, Order, Form," are technical, signifying not the manner of performing service, but the services themselves. A Rite is an Office, Ritual is the mode of performing it; Ceremony, according to the Thirtieth Canon of 1603, signifies a symbolic action, as, for instance, the sign of the Cross. The breaking of Bread in the Eucharist is a Ceremony, the Laying on of hands is a Ceremony. But the use of a Crucifix or Cross, or lighted Candles on the Altar, Incense, the Mixed Chalice, are not Ceremonies, but Usages, which are provided for either by the Canon Law or Canonical Custom; "Manner of Mass" does not refer, in our opinion, to the Usages, but to the diverse Uses or modes of celebrating Mass under the former Missals. The object was to abolish the customs *peculiar* to each of those Rites; not the Usages which were *common* to the whole Church, and which were ordered by Canon. Be this however as it may, the Judicial Committee, in the passage above quoted, have so far settled the question that the use of all Ornaments not specially mentioned in the Prayer Book is not illegal, so that the clause referred to must be held not to exclude the Ecclesiastical Customs and Usages which had not been expressly abrogated.

The conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing considerations is this, that with the exception of the Ornaments and Usages specified above, the law of Ritual, after the passing of the first

Act of Uniformity, remained unchanged; that under the Book of 1549 the following Ornaments and Usages continued in Canonical and Legal use: viz. (1) The Altar; (2) The Credence; (3) The Piscina; (4) The Sedilia; (5) The Easter Sepulchre, with the Light; (6) The two Lights on the High Altar; (7) The Tapers for the Gospel; (8) Light on the Rood-loft; (9) The Crucifix or Cross on the High Altar; (10) Incense; (11) The Pax; (12) The Vestments, &c. *i. e.* Chasuble, Dalmatic, Tunicle, Albe, Cope, Surplice, Stole, Biretta; and for a Bishop the Rochet, Mitre, Pastoral Staff or Crozier, the Ring, &c.; (13) Holy Water; (14) Oil or Unction. All these Ornaments and Usages, in the absence of any law to the contrary, were retained and were in use under the new Book of Common Prayer till 1552. The old Canon Law, it should be borne in mind, had not been repealed, but we reserve our remarks on this point till we arrive at the discussion of the last revision of the Prayer Book.

III. The Second Book of 1552. The important differences between the First and Second Books, so far as our subject is concerned, consist—

(1) In the following Rubric prefixed to the Order for Morning Prayer:—"And here it is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of Communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope: but being an Archbishop, or Bishop, he shall have and wear a Rochet: and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a Surplice only."

(2) In the First Book the Priest was directed to stand "afore the midst of the Altar" at the commencement of the Liturgy, whereas the Second and subsequent Books direct him to stand at "the north side of the table." Much controversy has arisen about this expression "north side." Some persons are to be found who hold it to mean the north *end*, others the northern section of the Altar. In the interpretation of documents care should be taken to construe them according to Canonical and Legal principle. Much light will be thrown on this subject by reference to the Coronation Service, which is an ancient Rite. The Archbishop is therein directed to stand "at the north side of the Altar," the Queen kneeling at her faldstool "on the south side of the Altar," the Dean and Prebendaries of Westminster standing "on the south side, *east* of the Queen's chair nearer to the Altar." It is clearly manifest, therefore, that the "north side" does not signify the "north end" as some seem to assume. The position, then, of the Priest at the commencement of the Liturgy was in front of the Altar, midway between the centre

and its north corner. [For further information see "Introduction to the Liturgy" in the *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, lately published by Messrs. Rivington, pp. 159, 160.]

(3) The omission of the mixture of a little pure and clean Water with the Wine, commonly known as the "Mixed Chalice."

(4) The omission of a very important rubric in the Canon of the First Prayer Book, to wit:—"These words before rehearsed [*i. e.* the Words of Institution] are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any Elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people." It has been held that the non-appearance of this rubric in the Second Book concerning the Mixed Chalice rendered it unlawful for Priests henceforth to mix Water with the Wine before consecration; if so, then the prohibition to Elevate the Sacrament, for the purpose of showing It to the people, having been removed, this custom has been revived.

(5) The elimination of all directions relating to the Manual Acts in the Consecration of the Blessed Sacrament.

(6) The excision of the Sacrament of Unction from the Order for the Visitation of the Sick.

With the exception of these specified alterations, no ritual or ceremonial changes were legally made in the mode of conducting Divine Service. The Two Lights legally remained upon the High Altar; Incense was not prohibited; the only difference, so far as the Ornaments were concerned, was that the Minister or Priest should wear a Surplice instead of the Albe, Vestment, or Cope. Whether the rubric immediately prefixed to the Order for Morning Prayer is to be construed strictly as prohibitory, is held, and with some reason, to be doubtful. It is certain from the second Act of Uniformity (the 5 and 6 Edward VI. c. 1) that the departures from the Order of the First Book were made unwillingly by Parliament, and out of consideration for the weak brethren. The preamble informs us (1) that "a very godly order [had been] set forth by the Authority of Parliament, for Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments to be used in the mother tongue within the Church of England, *agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church*, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation" . . . but (2) that "notwithstanding, a great number of people . . . following their own sensuality, and living either without knowledge or due fear of God" refuse to attend their parish Churches. The statute then proceeds to confirm the newly-modified Book of Common Prayer—*i. e.* the Second Book. It is reasonable to hold that Ornaments and Usages held to be "agreeable to the Word of God and the Primi-

tive Church" (*i. e.* the first "five hundred years and more after CHRIST'S Ascension." See 1 Edward VI. c. 1. s. vii.) would still be legal, though perhaps no longer obligatory upon Priests and people. Be this however as it may, both the First Book of 1549 and the Second Book of 1552 were abolished upon the accession of Queen Mary, who restored the Ecclesiastical state of things as they had been before the rupture with the Court of Rome, which continued till her death, in the year 1558.

IV. The Third and Fourth Books of 1559 and 1604. Queen Elizabeth, soon after her accession, restored the Second Book of 1552, after effecting a few important alterations, with, however, a proviso that the ancient Ornaments should be revived. To effect this, the rubric immediately before the Order of Morning Prayer was thus amended:—"And here it is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such Ornaments in the Church, as were in use by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI. according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this Book." This "Act of Parliament" was the 1 Eliz. c. 2, which, after establishing the Third Book of 1559, added this proviso:—"Provided always, and be it enacted, That such Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in Use, as was in this Church of England by Authority of Parliament, in the Second year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other Order shall be therein taken by the Authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the Advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm." It has been said that the Queen did take order when the Advertisements of 1564 were issued. But it is evident they never received the Royal assent, and therefore they can have no legal *force*. They were however Synodical acts, and as such they deserve to be treated with respect. The only points in them that touch our subject are the following:—"Item, In ministration of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and collegiate Churches, the principal Minister shall use a cope with Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be sayde at the Communion Table, to use no Copes, but surplesses." "Item, That every minister sayinge any publique prayers, or ministringe of Sacramentes or other Rites of the churche, shall weare, a comely Surples with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parishe; and that the parishe provide a decente table standinge on a frame for the Communion

table" (Cardwell's *Doc. Ann.* vol. i. p. 326). It is evident that these Advertisements were not intended to "take order" in the sense of the Act of Uniformity of 1 Eliz. c. 2, but to compel the clergy to observe a minimum decency of ritual. Indeed, the "Protestations" affixed to these Advertisements show that there was no intention of abrogating the ancient Ornaments of the Church and the Usages appertaining unto them. "I do also faithfully promise . . . to observe, kepe, and mantayne suche order and uniformity in all external policye, rites, and ceremonies of the Church, as by the lawes, good usages, and orders are already well provided and established" (*Ibid.* p. 331). The "Lawes," "good Usages," and "Orders" are three distinct authorities:—(1) The Acts of Uniformity and the Canon law generally, (2) The Usages which were customary time out of mind, and not abrogated, and (3) The Orders made by the Royal Injunctions. So that it is clear that these Advertisements did not intend to abrogate the old "lawes and good usages," but to enforce a minimum of observance upon a rebellious and careless ministry and people. This we think is inferentially proved by the thirtieth Canon of 1603, which synodically declared the principle that the Ornaments, Ceremonial, and Usages of the Church of England in the time of King James were substantially the same as those of the Catholic Church abroad, minus only "those particular points, wherein they had fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders." It is then manifest that both legally and canonically the ancient Ornaments, Usages, and Ceremonial connected with the Mass, that is to say, Vestments, Lights, Incense, the Mixed Chalice, were retained and were in use (*i. e.* Legally and Canonically) until the Great Rebellion.

Before we proceed further, let us briefly consider how the services of the Church in the time of Queen Elizabeth were actually conducted. We will take two Chapels as fair representatives of the lawful mode of conducting Divine Service under the Book of 1559, *viz.* the Queen's Chapel and that of Bishop Andrewes.

(1) In Queen Elizabeth's Chapel there was a Crucifix with Two Lights upon the Altar at the Celebration of the Holy Communion. "Oh! my Father," complains Thomas Sampson, "what can I hope for, when the ministry of CHRIST is banished from Court, while the image of the Crucifix is allowed, with Lights burning before it? . . . What can I hope, when three of our lately appointed Bishops are to officiate at the Table of the

Lord, one as a Priest, another as a Deacon, and a third as a Sub-Deacon, before the image of the crucifix, or at least not far from it, with Candles, and habited in the golden Vestments of the papacy; and are thus to celebrate the Lord's Supper without any sermon?" (*Zurich Letters*, 1st Series, No. xxvii. pp. 63, 64. See Perry's *Lawful Ornaments*, pp. 159).

(2) The following is an account of the Ornaments in Bishop Andrewes' Chapel:—"Two Candlesticks with tapers; the silver and gilt Canister for the Wafers; the Tonne upon a cradle; a linen Napkin (called the Aire) to cover the Chalice, embroidered with coloured silks; the Tricanale, being a round ball with a screw cover, whereout issued three pipes, and is for the Water of Mixture; a sier (side?) Table, on which, before the Communion, stand [the Canister and the Tonne] upon two napkins; a Basin and Ewer, to wash before Consecration; the Towel appertaining; a triquertral Censer, wherein the Clerk putteth Frankincense at the reading of the first Lesson; the Navicula, out of which the Frankincense is poured; and five Copes" (*Minor Works*, p. xcvii; see *Ibid.* p. 352).

The examples of this these two Chapels clearly prove what sort of Ceremonial was intended to be used under the Book of Common Prayer of 1559. Queen Elizabeth is undoubtedly the best interpreter as to her own intentions, when she enacted her Statute of Uniformity, and Bishop Andrewes, the most illustrious Divine of his age, is an unexceptional witness on the part of the Church, on the question, what Ornaments and their Usages were retained under the Book of 1559. Taking these two Chapels, of the Queen and of this eminent Bishop, in connexion with the Thirtieth Canon, already more than once referred to, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Canonical and Legal Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, and the Usages connected therewith, were identically the same as those of the churches of "Italy, France, Spain, and Germany." It is, we repeat, impossible to come to any other conclusion, that, notwithstanding the opposition of foreign Protestants and their followers in this country, Queen Elizabeth, Kings James and Charles, and the most learned Bishops in their reigns, favoured the preservation of the Catholic Ceremonial, though they were not able to enforce its observance.

V. We come now to the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Whatever defects there were in the law respecting the enforcement of the Ancient Ritual, were corrected by the Prayer Book of 1662, *i.e.* the Book now in use. All the Synodical Acts

of Convocation, the Injunctions of King Edward VI. subsequent to 1549, the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, the Advertisements, &c., which had for their effect the lowering of the standard of Catholic Ritual, were abolished by this revised Prayer Book. The following are the alterations of the Ceremonial Rubrics:—

The Ornaments Rubric was for the second time amended thus:—"And here is to be noted, that such Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof at all times of their Ministration, shall be retained, and be in use as were in this Church of England by the Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth." The alterations effected in the former Rubric, and in the corresponding section in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, were important, viz. (*a*) The excision of the concluding words of the Rubric, "according to the Act of Parliament" [*i.e.* 1 Eliz. c. 2], "set in the beginning of this book," and (*b*) the omission of the words in the Act itself "until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's majestie." Considering that the Rubric of 1662 was taken verbatim from this Act, rather than from the Rubric of former Books, these alterations are very significant, as showing that the intention, both of Convocation and Parliament, was to revert absolutely and imperatively to the customs of the second year of King Edward the Sixth. (*c*) Again, the language of the new Rubric was stronger than the former one; for instead of "shall use such Ornaments," there was substituted "shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England," &c., terms far more precise and definite. The Law now relating "to Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof," together with the Usages inseparably connected with them, is absolutely neither more nor less than what was authorized by Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI. The Judicial Committee ruled that this "authority of Parliament" refers to the first Statute of Uniformity, which legalized the Prayer Book of 1549. It has been already shown that the Ceremonial of High Mass was continued under that Book; the Two Lights, Vestments, Incense, &c., were in Canonical and Legal use; that in point of fact it was a matter of complaint at that period, that there was no appreciable difference between the Usages of the reformed and unreformed Liturgy.

But the point whether the Canon Law is not a part of the "authority of Parliament," is worthy of careful investigation. The foreign and the English Canon Law were recognized by the Statutes of 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19; 27 Hen. VIII. c. 15; 35 Hen. VIII. c. 16, and afterwards by the 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 11.

The object of these statutes was not to abolish the Canon Law, but to revise it; and provision was made, especially in 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, that, until revised, they (excepting only what was contrary to law) should "still be used and executed as they were afore the making of this Act." And this point seems to have been incidentally admitted by the Judicial Committee, for they said, speaking of the Ornaments, that "Vestments, Books, Cloths, Chalices, and Patens are amongst Church Ornaments; a long list of them will be found extracted from Lyndwood, in Dr. Phillimore's edition of Burn's *Ecclesiastical Law* (vol. i. pp. 375—377; *Eccl. Jud.* p. 129). Now this list was originally extracted by Lyndwood from Archbishop Gray's Constitutions, A.D. 1250; Archbishop Peckham's Constitutions, A.D. 1281; and Archbishop Winchelsey's Constitutions, A.D. 1305; *i.e.* from the ancient, unrepealed Canon Law.

It is then of importance that the true position of the Canon Law, as part of the "authority of Parliament" mentioned in the Rubric, and which has never as yet been abrogated or repealed, be maintained. This view is confirmed by Bishop Cosin, who had a large share in the last revision. He says: ". . . The particulars of these Ornaments (both of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, as in the end of the Act of Uniformity,) was referred, not to the fifth of Edw. VI., as the Service itself is in the beginning of that Act,—for in that fifth year were all Ornaments taken away (but a Surplice only), both from Bishops and Priests, and all other Ministers, and nothing was left for the Church but a Font, a Table, and a Linen Cloth upon it (at the time of the Communion only),—but to the second year of that King, when his Service-book and Injunctions were in force by authority of Parliament. And in those Books many other Ornaments are appointed, as two Lights to be set upon the Altar or Communion Table, a Cope or Vestment for the Priest and for the Bishop, besides their Albs, Surplices, and Rochets, the Bishop's Crosier-staff to be holden by him at his ministration and ordinations; and these Ornaments of the Church, which by former laws, not then abrogated, were in use, by virtue of the Statute 25 Hen. VIII., and for them the Provincial Constitutions are to be consulted, such as have not been repealed, standing then in the second year of King Edw. VI. and being still in force by virtue of this Rubric and Act of Parliament. That which is to be said for these Vestures and Ornaments, in solemnizing the Service of GOD, is, that they were appointed for inward reverence to that work, which they make outwardly solemn. All the actions of esteem in the world are so set forth, and the world hath had

trial enough, that those who have made it a part of their religion to fasten scorn upon such circumstances, have made no less to deface and disgrace the substance of God's Service" (Cosin's *Works*, vol. v. pp. 438, 439; *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*)

We think then that it is incontestable that the "authority of Parliament," as stated in the Rubric, includes within its scope (1) The Act of Uniformity of 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 1, and the Statutes 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19; 27 Hen. VIII. c. 15; 35 Hen. VIII. c. 16; and 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 11, which recognized the legal existence of both the Roman and English Canon Law, except only such portions as were contrary to the Statute Law and the King's prerogative. All these statutes were repealed by Queen Mary, but the 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19 was revived by Elizabeth, and in all its branches was extended to herself, her heirs and successors (see 1 Eliz. c. 1). (2) The Restoration of the Oblation of Bread and Wine, before consecration, which is made in the "Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth." (3) The direction to the Priest to "stand before the Table" at the Prayer of Consecration. (4) Minute directions given with regard to the Manual Acts in the Consecration of the Blessed Sacrament, probably to remedy the carelessness of past times. (5) The restoration of the Great Antiphons to the Magnificat from the 16th December until Christmas Eve. These were first restored in the Calendar of the Book of 1604, and continued in the present Book.

These seem to be the extent of the Ritual and Ceremonial reforms effected in the Prayer Book of 1662. But before we conclude this part of our subject, we should not pass over the Preface to this Book, for in it there are some important points to be considered. First, it asserts that "it has been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Public Liturgy, to keep the mean between two extreams." The obvious meaning of this is, that her object was to avoid "the great excess and multitude" of Ceremonies which had been common before the Reformation, "the burden" of which "was intolerable," and on the other hand Puritan "innovations and newfangleness." What the Church of England desired, was to worship God according to the Usages of the Primitive Church. Secondly, while admitting the lawfulness of abolishing or changing the "Forms of Divine Worship and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used," she carefully adds the following proviso: —"Yet so, as the main body and essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof)" are preserved. The Church of England thus acknowledges her submis-

sion to the Catholic rule of Worship, claiming the right of regulating her Forms of Prayer, and her Rites and Ceremonies, yet, admitting the necessity of preserving "the main body and essentials" of the same. Whatever may be Scriptural, or Primitive, or Universal, she includes, as being part of "the main body and essentials" of Worship. If then the accessories of Divine Service possess Scriptural and Œcumenical authority, it must be evident they belong to the "main body." The word "essential" is not to be limited to the mere essence of Eucharistic Worship, it includes the whole "frame and order" thereof, together with the Usages and Ornaments.

VI. Having thus entered somewhat minutely into the Law of Ritual, we will now briefly review the principles on which the several documents, referred to above, relied for the elucidation of what have been assumed to be doubtful questions of Ritual.

1. The Case prepared for the Four Counsel on "behalf of several Archbishops and Bishops," demands our first attention. It admits, after quoting the Ornaments Rubric of 1662, and comparing it with the directions contained in the First Prayer Book of 1549, that those who "seek to revive the use of such of those habits as have become obsolete, *have law on their side.*" But the Case maintains, and the Counsel in their opinion confirm it, that the 'Interpretations' of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, the 'Advertisements' of 1565, and the XXIVth, XXVth, LVIIIth Canons of 1603 have so modified the law that such Ornaments as were fallen into desuetude are no longer obligatory.

To this it may be replied: That before these Documents could, under the circumstances of the Church of England, be binding on the Clergy, they must have received the Royal Assent. The law respecting the Ornaments was undoubtedly clear, that such as were in use by the authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI., were to be retained and used under the Prayer Book of 1559, until other order should be taken by the Queen, with the advice of her Commissioners, or of the Metropolitan of the Realm; the question then naturally arises—Did the Queen take any "Order" in the matter of Ceremonies and Ornaments? It is an admitted fact she never did; on the contrary she was, as is well known, favourably disposed to the ancient mode of celebrating Mass, and therefore she was the last person in the world to 'take order' in the sense of abolishing the Ecclesiastical Ornaments and Usages. Neither the "Interpretations" nor the "Advertisements" ever received the Royal Assent, and therefore they are void in law.

The Canons XXIV., XXV., and LVIII., however, stand on different ground, inasmuch as they did, together with the other Canons and Constitutions, receive the 'Royal Assent and Licence.' But it may be asked whether these provisions are agreeable to the law of the land? If not, then they are contrariant to the law, and have consequently no legal force. For if their intention was to modify the language of the Ornaments Rubric, so as to render its terms less stringent than they were, then they would be taking upon themselves the Parliamentary office of altering the existing law, which, as every lawyer knows, is legally inadmissible. For no Canon can override, or even explain an Act of Parliament. It seems to be assumed, however, that this XXIVth Canon, referring as it does to the "Advertisements," amounts in effect to the Crown taking order in the matter of Church Ornaments, with the advice at least "of the Metropolitan of this Realm." To this we would reply that the Canons were not made under the authority of the 25th section of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, but of the 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, which strictly forbids Canons to be made "by the authority of the Convocation of the Clergy, which shall be contrariant or repugnant to . . . the Customs Laws or Statutes of this realm." The Case and Opinion of the Counsel employed by "certain Archbishops and Bishops," utterly break down, for both are founded upon certain Documents which were doubtless useful for the time for securing a *minimum* of Ritual in a spiritually lawless age, but which have nevertheless no legal position, and therefore utterly destitute of authority for either repealing the Ornaments Rubric or the 25th section of the Elizabethan Statute of Uniformity, or for modifying its terms.

But even assuming for the moment, that the "Interpretations," and the "Advertisements," together with the XXIVth, XXVth, and LVIIIth Canons had legal effect in 1564 and 1604, how could they modify the *subsequent* Statute of 1662, which legalized the present Ornaments Rubric? This Rubric, as is well known, was drawn up in more precise and absolute terms than the corresponding Rubric of 1559 and 1604, and the 25th section of 1 Eliz. c. 2. In the former Documents, as we have observed above, the Sovereign was empowered to "take order," if he thought fit, in the settlement of Ornaments; but the last form of the Rubric, which has been confirmed by law, has omitted this provision, and has thus made the Ornaments of King Edward VI.'s second year absolutely binding on the Clergy. It follows then that the Injunctions, the Interpretations, the Advertisements, the Canons, so far as they are contrary to or inconsis-

tent with the terms of the Rubric of 1662, are, whatever they may have been, void in law.

2. The opinion of the Nine eminent Counsel consulted by the English Church Union is more to our purpose. The Case is most ably and impartially drawn, and it is wonderful that the Counsel should have decided as they did on several important points, such, for instance, as the use of Incense. It seems to be a mental defect in some of our first Ecclesiastical and civil jurists, that they cannot understand that the Canonical and Legal history of the Church of England did not commence at the Reformation. They appear to assume that Ecclesiastical Law took its rise in the sixteenth century, and that all the Laws and Usages of a thousand years previously have no legal bearing on the many weighty questions presented to them for their opinion. Vestments are held to be legal simply because they are specified in the First Prayer Book; Lights, because they are evidently mentioned in the Injunctions of 1547. Incense is held to be illegal and unauthorized, inasmuch as it is not *prescribed* in the Formularies; and so on. This is a matter of very serious importance, and unless our lawyers can be induced to take a larger and broader, as well as a more equitable and more legal view of the whole question of Ecclesiastical Law, at least as much so as in questions of civil law and custom, grievous injustice to the Church of England and her faithful sons and daughters may be ultimately the result.

As it has been observed above, if the Church of England is a new Church, dating no further back than the sixteenth century, and without any connexion with the Catholic Church, then it must be conceded that the laws and customs prior to the Reformation have, so far as she is concerned, become obsolete. But suppose that the Church of England is a part of the great Catholic Family of the Redeemer, and that she has never ceased to exist in the land from the day she was first planted to the present, then in conclusion two things must follow:—(1) That the Church of England inherits the whole Catholic Faith, and the Catholic form and mode of Worship; and (2) that her whole Ecclesiastical Law (except what has been specially repealed) from the earliest period of her history, is binding upon her Clergy and people. Both the first and last Acts of Uniformity, of 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 1, and 13 and 14 Car. II. c. 4, affirm that the Church, in remodelling her ancient Services, had "as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian Religion taught by the Scriptures *as to the Usages of the Primitive Church.*" And King Charles II. in his Commission to certain Bishops and others for

authorizing a revision of the Book of Common Prayer, directed them to compare "the same with the most Ancient Liturgies which have been used in the Church in the primitive and purest times." Whatever then was customary in the Primitive Church, as regarded the essential features of Divine Worship, was intended to be preserved in the reformed Anglican Liturgy. This is a self-evident deduction from the principle laid down by the Statute of Uniformity and the King's Commission, viz., that the "Usages of the Primitive Church" were continued in the Reformed Church of England. If this be not conceded, the Statute is at fault.

Now what were the Usages common in the early Church, in respect to the accessories of Divine Worship? Holy Scripture, referred to by the Act, recognizes three especial Usages—1. Lights, 2. Incense, and 3. Vestments. These were made known, first by vision to Moses, and afterwards to S. John the Divine, for the guidance of the Catholic Church. These Usages, then, are *Scriptural;* and as the Church of England appeals unreservedly to Holy Scripture, it must be held that she has never rejected them. The Primitive Church (*i.e.*, the period of the first "five hundred years or more" of the Christian era), has in the Third Apostolical Canon (as old certainly as the second or third Century) directed that, with certain exceptions, nothing should be brought "to the Altar at the time of the Holy Oblation, excepting Oil for the Lamps, and Incense," and it is notorious that these accessories and usages were common to all the Primitive Liturgies. Incense is especially mentioned in the Liturgies of S. James, S. Mark, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, &c., as being almost an essential feature in the Service. It is impossible then to doubt, taking into consideration the fact that both Church and State professed to conform to the "Usages of the Primitive Church," that Lights, Vestments, and Incense, the Mixed Chalice, and Elevation were perfectly legal. To assert the contrary, is to ignore the foundation—Scripture and the Usages of the Primitive Church—on which the Reformation was established, and on which alone it was justifiable. Counsel, therefore, were bound, we think, to take into account this portion of the great question of Ritual Law. But let it be granted that Counsel were justified in ignoring the Primitive Usages of the Church, how was it they took no account of the ancient Canon Law?

In the second year of King Edward VI. the old Canon Laws (except what was contrary to Statute Law) were in full Canonical force, nay, they had been, as observed above, recognized by King Henry VIII., and also by Edward VI. in the third and fourth

year of his reign, *i. e.* subsequent to the establishment of the Prayer Book of 1549. They were acknowledged in Queen Elizabeth's "Act for restoring to the Crown the Ancient Jurisdiction," which revived in all its "branches, sentences, and words," the Statute, 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19. Have these Canons ever been repealed by Parliament or Convocation, or, co-ordinately, by both? If so, when? There is no record, as is very well known, of any such repeal. If so, how comes it, then, that Counsel ignored the authority of this Ecclesiastical Code? That it was part of that "authority of Parliament" alluded to in the Ornaments Rubric, we have proved to have been the case, and which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had indirectly, if not directly, admitted. Had they consulted this Code, and taken into account that no law, nor custom, nor usage, can possibly become legally obsolete, they must have concluded that Vestments, Lights, Incense, &c., were perfectly legal, inasmuch as no law, canon, nor ordinance had ever forbidden their continuance; and as they were perfectly consistent with the reformed services under the first, intermediate, and last Book of Common Prayer.

3. The valuable Report of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury accepts the general principle of law and usage which we have maintained in this Essay. It informs us that "next in order to the assertion of the general principle, that regard be had to the mind of the Church of England, the Committee would observe that the evidence of that mind is not one, but of many periods and of many kinds. It consists partly of the recognition of general principles of the Church Catholic, and of their retention, as such, by our Branch of it at the time of the Reformation; partly of particular precedents of our own; partly of Statute Law, partly of Canon; partly of definite direction from time to time by lawful authority; partly of prescriptive use." The Report admits, then, the whole principle contended for; (1) that the Church of England is an ancient Church, and a portion of the Holy Catholic Church; (2) that it is bound by (*a*) the Statute Law, (*b*) the Canon Law, (*c*) the Judgment of the proper "lawful authority;" and (3) "prescriptive Use," *i. e.*, the Customs and Usages of the Church existing from time out of mind. Starting from these premises, the Report speaks, upon the whole, approvingly, though of course with great caution, of the use of Vestments, Lights, Incense, &c., on the ground of their antiquity: and the Report further adds that these Usages should not be abolished, even if they continue in abeyance, for the sake of the future Re-union of Christendom, now so sadly divided.

With respect to one Usage, *viz.* Incense, we think the opinion

of the Committee thereon is inconsistent with the principles it affirms. It declares that "the censing of persons and things" is "inadmissible," and that the proper mode of burning Incense is in a "standing vessel." Now it must be obvious that if Incense is lawful at all, it can only be used in one way, and that in accordance with the customs of the Catholic Church. When the First Prayer Book of 1549 was issued, it was customary to cense "persons and things." For instance, in the Sarum Use: "Tunc Diaconus ei thuribulum tradens deosculetur manum ejus. Et ipse Sacerdos thurificet medium Altaris, et utrumque cornu Altaris. Deinde ab ipso Diacono ipse Sacerdos thurificetur." Again: "Hoc peracto accipiat thuribulum a Diacono et thurificet Sacrificium: videlicet ultra ter signum Crucis faciens, et in circuitu et ex utraque parte calicis et Sacrificii: deinde locum inter se et Altare." In the York Use: "Et postea incenset altare." In the Hereford Use, "His finitis Diaconus antequam procedat ad pronuntiandum Evangelium thurificet medium Altaris tantum: nunquam thurificetur lectrinum ante pronuntiationem Evangelii" (Maskell's *Liturgies of the Church of England*, pp. 18, 20, 41, 43, 60, Lond. 1846). This is sufficient to show that, up to the establishment of the Prayer Book of 1549, it was customary to cense persons and things; and, with the exception of censing of images, the custom has never been changed. If, then, Incense is lawful, it *must* be used, not in the "new-fangled" mode, common in the most debased age of the Church, but as the Canon Law and Custom direct.

Equally inconsistent is the Report respecting Elevation. It is true the Committee have assumed a practice of Elevation which does not really exist. None of the clergy, as far as we know, practise Elevation *after* Consecration, *i. e.* after the completion of the Prayer of Consecration. The object of the Elevation is not to invite adoration (though we all do adore as in duty bound, because of the Real Objective Presence of our Redeemer and God, for if Scripture and antiquity mean any thing, they assert His true and real Presence), but to show the Lord's Death to His Father. The rubric, in both the first and last Books of 1549 and 1662, directs the Priest to take in their turn the Paten and the Cup "into his hands." Wherefore? For the purpose of mere consecration this is unnecessary; for he is directed to lay his hand upon "every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated." It is not, then, for any reason of convenience that the Priest is directed to "take into his hands" the vessels which contain the Bread and the Wine. Why then is this action specially ordered? The answer is, because Elevation

for the purpose of showing forth the Death of CHRIST is an essential part of the function, and in accordance with the Institution at the Last Supper.

The Rubric in the First Prayer Book of 1549, forbidding Elevation, refers to a particular kind of action. It says, "The words before rehearsed are to be said, *turning* still to the Altar, without any Elevation, *or showing the Sacrament to the people.*" This seems to imply there was a custom of the Priest turning round after the Consecration for the purpose of "showing the Sacrament to the people." This was no doubt to invite adoration, which, in consequence of the gross and carnal view of the Real Presence at that time commonly prevalent, was no longer permitted; but this prohibition had nothing to do with the Elevation *during* the Act of Consecration. In fact it is ordered by the rubric—"Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands;" "here he is to take the Cup into his hand." The Committee then are so far inconsistent, that while forbidding Elevation *after* Consecration, they did not boldly assert its propriety *during* this solemn action. The Report of the President and Council of the English Church Union has some valuable remarks on this point. "It must be observed, however, that the words 'after Consecration' are inaccurate; for the elevation apparently objected to takes place *during*, and is *a part of* the Act of consecration. Moreover, as the Committee only define their meaning of Elevation by referring to the Rubric on the subject in the Prayer Book of 1549, and as the marginal Rubrics of the Prayer of Consecration, both in that Book and in the present Book, require some kind of Elevation, it may fairly be assumed that the objection of the Committee is limited to that particular action which (as not being *essential* to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and as being connected at that time with a then prevalent belief in a carnal Presence) was forbidden by the First Prayer Book in the direction, 'These words, &c.' Besides, some Act of Elevation when saying the Words of Institution, is a very ancient Catholic Usage, intended to 'show forth the LORD'S Death till He come;' and, therefore, it must be presumed that the Committee did not intend to discountenance this ancient and edifying action, which the Church of England has never forbidden" (see *English Church Union Monthly Circular*, vol. ii. p. 207). It is impossible that the Committee could have intended to discountenance this Usage, if regard be had to the general principles of law they had asserted in the preamble of their Report.

With respect to the disapproval of the Committee (with certain exceptions), of the "the encouragement of Non-communicants" remaining "during the Celebration of the Holy Communion,"

we would venture to make a few observations. We presume that by "Non-communicants" is meant, not persons who never communicate from year's end to year's end, but those who receive the Blessed Sacrament occasionally, at least three times a year. If the Committee mean that these ought not to be encouraged to remain, though not communicating every time, then they have expressed an opinion wholly unsupported by the law or custom of the Church, and an opinion moreover for which they adduce not a particle of historical or theological proof. According to the rule of the Church, the Blessed Sacrament ought to be celebrated daily, and if we were all perfect Saints we ought to receive daily. But we are far from being perfect; and Churchmen differ widely in degrees of strictness and holiness of life. Some receive daily, many weekly, a large number monthly, and others only three, or four, or six times a year. Are those who do not consider themselves worthy to receive often, to be debarred from the benefits to be obtained by taking part in the Sacrifice, and of receiving CHRIST *spiritually?* Do the Committee infer that no benefits at all are to be derived from taking part in a Celebration without at that time communicating? This is impossible; and yet this part of their Report seems to express disapproval of any 'Non-communicating attendance,' except in the case of persons under penance. But then the question naturally arises—Why should persons "in the last stage in the course of penitential discipline" be allowed to be present at the Sacrifice if there were no benefits to be derived without communicating? This alone justifies the attendance, if not of habitual Non-communicants, at least of all those who communicate as often as the Church commands, but who do not deem themselves worthy to receive oftener. If persons under penance were thus permitted, and benefited accordingly, why should persons not under penance, but who are occasional Communicants, be forbidden to be present? If penitents are allowed, why not the Faithful?

The Committee refer to a direction in the First Prayer Book of 1549 for Non-communicants to "depart out of the quire, except the Ministers and Clerks." The Committee seemed to have missed the force of these words, "out of the quire." This does not mean *out of the church*, but simply out of the chancel, to make room for the intended Communicants. The Committee further say that this practice of Non-communicating attendance "is opposed to the usage of the ancient Church." Now this is scarcely according to fact. S. Chrysostom complains of the infrequency of Communions in his day, which he endeavoured to correct. But he nowhere forbids persons to be present at the

Liturgy who do not intend to communicate. Indeed, it was against the Canon Law for any person, except the catechumens and certain penitents, to quit the church till the Liturgy was completed. (See the IXth Apostolical Canon.)

On these two points, then, "Incense" and "Non-communicating attendance," the Committee are inconsistent with their own principles. But upon the whole, the Report is a valuable document, worthy of the respectful attention of all Churchmen desirous of truth and peace.

VII. We have lastly to consider the present position of the whole question of Ritual, and its probable future development in the Church of England.

It is now admitted by those who have studied the law of the case, that Lights, Vestments, and Incense at least in a standing vessel, and the Mixed Chalice, may be lawfully used, even if they are not obligatory upon the Clergy. It is true that suits have begun in the Ecclesiastical Court; but assuming that the Judges will approach this subject without prejudice, and in accordance with those legal principles which have always governed judicial investigation and decision, there can be no doubt what will be the Judgment of the Court of Appeal on the several grave questions that will be submitted for its final adjudication. We have, then, nothing to fear from an appeal to the Law Courts, if we should be forced to enter their solemn precincts.

As regards the future prospect of Ritual development, it is in the hands of God and His faithful people. That the "Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof" are of Divine origin, the Holy Scriptures afford undoubted evidence, while the Universal Church of all ages has stamped this truth on the Catholic mind by the force of œcumenical and infallible authority. To resist, then, this overwhelming evidence of the Divine intention as respects the accessories of Worship, is vain. Ritual may be put down, no doubt, for the moment, by the strong arm of power, but only to revive with greater intensity than ever.

To exterminate the so-called 'Ritualists'—a term, it may be remarked in passing, given to, but not assumed by, those whom it very inadequately describes—from the Church of England, is an impossibility, for it is the natural expression of the life of Faith and Devotion. As long as the Church of England was overwhelmed with hostile influences, fomented by foreign Protestants and domestic Puritans; as long as she was in a dormant state of inactivity, when her people had little or no faith, when devotion, beyond a dull moral respectability, was unknown,

Ceremonial Worship was an idea far beyond the spiritual capabilities of Churchmen. But now the Church has arisen from her long deep sleep; she is now proclaiming the Catholic Faith of CHRIST every where in England. Having renovated her glorious Cathedrals and noble Parish Churches to more than their former splendour, she is now restoring that Catholic Form of Worship, as exhibited in model in the Isle of Patmos, and practised more or less ever since by the whole Church—even that Worship whose norm is in the Liturgy of the First Eucharist, which the HOLY GHOST, throughout the Church, developed first in the Apostolic Liturgies, and subsequently in the Missals of Catholic Christendom.

Before Ritual can be extinguished in the Church of England, the living Church must be either destroyed or expelled. It is written, "By their fruits ye shall know them." What applies to persons will also apply to principles. How is the spread of Ritualism to be accounted for? How is it that in many Churches where there is no Ritual, the people are more or less irreverent, seldom kneeling at the prayers, and showing by their conduct their disbelief in even a Presence by Grace? Many and many churches of this sort have we visited in various parts of the kingdom, and we can safely aver that beyond a very few persons, the congregations were irreverent, if not intentionally, at least so by habit. Now, compare this with the so-called 'Ritual' Churches. We ask, Are not the people who regularly attend devout? Do they not kneel at the prayers? Do they not visibly adore the Unseen GOD? In a word, Do they not 'Worship?' "By their fruits ye shall know them." The principles which produce such results must be sound, must be Catholic, must be Divine. No wonder, then, that in every place in the land where there are devout people who believe in GOD's Truth, 'Ritualism' advances, and for this reason, because a Divine principle must attract to itself the great body of the Faithful.

Who are the persons who strive to put down our Catholic Services? Let us go back to the beginning of the movement. Who were the persons that attacked S. Barnabas, Pimlico? were they the Communicants, or even the regular Congregation? No; they were wicked persons, who cared for neither GOD nor man, and who had no connexion with the Church. Who was the prosecutor of Mr. Liddell, of S. Paul and S. Barnabas? Not the congregation of either of these Churches. Who strove to crush the noble efforts of the late Rector of S. George's in the East and his faithful band of Clergy and people? The refuse of the population, assisted and abetted by persons of position, who had

not the courage to avow the tactics they employed. Who are our opponents now? Are they the regular Communicants of the Church? Certainly not. Whom then have we to fear? If these are the instruments employed to crush the Catholic party, their efforts are futile, for our principles are founded on the Rock of Truth; and if our opponents believe they can destroy us because of our weakness and poverty, let them know that victory is not given to the strong, but to the weak. And as the poor and weak Christians of early days gradually succeeded in conquering the great Roman Empire, reducing it to the obedience of the Faith, so will it be now in these last days of reviving life in the Church; for as surely as GOD is Truth, so surely will Catholic Principles prevail, and will ultimately overmaster the ignorance, the prejudices, and the obstinacy of the people of England.

Let us then take courage, believing in GOD and in the eternal principles of Truth in all its parts, whether of Faith or Worship, praying too with all earnestness for the success of our great and holy cause; and then may we look forward to the time, not far distant, when the Prophecy will be fulfilled to the very letter, that "from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same . . . . in every place INCENSE shall be offered unto My Name, and a PURE OFFERING:" even the tremendous Unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar, which CHRIST Himself instituted, and which is perpetuated both in Heaven and earth, and will continue until the consummation of all things. And we will conclude this Essay by expressing our determination to "give unto the LORD the glory due unto His Name;" to "worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness;" to "beautify the place of His Sanctuary;" and to "make the place of His Feet," even the Holy Catholic Church, "glorious." Laus DEO.

COLIN LINDSAY.

Latitudinarianism.

Latitudinarianism is a wide subject, too wide, perhaps, to be discussed in a single Essay of the character of those contained in this volume. It is not proposed, however, to consider the subject fully. "There is nothing new under the sun," and so Latitudinarianism, as it has of late years appeared amongst us, is but a reproduction of a Religious System which obtained some notoriety, occasioned much trouble, and did immense injury in the Church of England nearly two centuries ago. It will, therefore, perhaps be sufficient for our present necessity to give a slight sketch of the history of Latitudinarianism, to point out its resemblance at the present time to what it was heretofore, and to show, by a consideration of a few of its principal characteristics, its thorough inconsistency with both the Revelation of the New Testament, and the system, as embodied in her formularies, of the Church of England.

The name of Arminius is associated in the minds of most men, even of those who take an interest in the affairs of Religion, simply with an opposition to Calvinism, on those points connected with Predestination and Grace, on which the teaching of Calvin agreed on the whole with the theories first brought into the Church by S. Augustine. But it is not generally known, or at least it is not generally remembered, that, revolted by the narrow principles of the Dutch Communion, in which he lived and bore office, first as a Preacher at Amsterdam, and afterwards as Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden, he laid the plan of a theological system, which might embrace all Christians, with the exception of Roman Catholics. This he declared in his last will in the following terms:—"I have set forth and taught those things . . . which might contribute according to the Word of God to the advancement and increase of Christian truth and religion, of the true worship of God, of general piety, and a holy conversation amongst men, and lastly to the tranquillity and peace which befit the Christian name, excluding from them the Papists, with whom no unity of faith, no bond of piety or Christian peace can be maintained" (Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, Maclaine's Translation, vol. v. p. 458, note 5).

Three years after the death of Arminius, which took place in

1609, his followers were ejected from the National Communion by the decisions of the Synod of Dort, in conformity with the sentiments of Calvin, on the five points of doctrine with which his name is usually connected. Upon their expulsion they proceeded, under the guidance of Episcopius, who had been a pupil of Arminius, and succeeded him in the professorship at Leyden, to form a communion of their own, from which, in accordance with the tenor of the will of their founder, none were excluded who were, as it is expressed, apparently in a document of authority, "free from idolatry," who received the Holy Scriptures, however they might choose to interpret them, as the sole rule of faith, who lived a moral and virtuous life, in obedience to the precepts of CHRIST, and who abstained from persecution. After this Synod of Dort, the sentiments of the Arminians underwent a remarkable change. They then gave a new explanation of those five points relating to the doctrines of Predestination and Grace, on which they had been condemned, that almost denied the necessity of Divine succour in the work of conversion and the attainment of holiness. "Nay, they went still further, and bringing the greatest part of the doctrines of Christianity before the tribunal of reason, they modified them considerably, and reduced them to an extensive degree of simplicity" (Mosheim, vol. v. p. 457).

The following account is given by Bishop Burnet, in his *History of his own Times,* of certain Divines in England, by whom their sentiments were regarded with favour, and who, in the main, agreed with them :—"They declared against superstition on the one hand and enthusiasm on the other. They loved the constitution of the Church, and the Liturgy, and could well live under them, but they did not think it unlawful to live under another form. They . . . allowed a great freedom both in philosophy and in divinity, from whence they were called 'Men of Latitude.' And upon that men of narrower thoughts and fiercer tempers fastened upon them the name of 'Latitudinarians.' They read Episcopius much. And the making out the reasons of things being a main part of their studies, their enemies called them Socinians" (Vol. i. pp. 323, 324, Oxford, 1823).

It will be seen from this account, that Latitudinarianism, like Puritanism, was a plant of foreign growth. Of Episcopius, whose writings thus contributed to its importation, we are told by Bishop Horsley that "though himself no Socinian, he very indiscreetly concurred with the Socinians of his time in maintaining that the opinion of the mere Humanity of CHRIST had prevailed very generally in the first ages, and was never deemed heretical by the Fathers of the Orthodox persuasion, at

least not in such degree as to exclude from the communion of the Church. Had the opinion which he chose to adopt been true, Simon Episcopius, with his scanty knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquities, was but ill-qualified to maintain it. False and groundless as it was, his natural acuteness enabled him to furnish the Socinians of his time, whose cause in the doctrinal part he little thought to serve, with the best arguments that have ever been produced on the Unitarian side of the question" (*Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley*, p. 10).

His general opinions, which, as we have seen, were those of Arminius, were first brought into England by John Hales, styled by his admirers 'the ever-memorable,' of Calvinistic bringing-up, who formed an intimacy with him at the Synod of Dort, whither he accompanied Sir Dudley Carleton, the English Ambassador. The following is Mr. Hales' doctrine on the nature and marks of the Church:—"The Church, as it imports, a visible company in earth, is nothing else but the company of professors of Christianity, wheresoever dispersed in the earth. . . . Government, whether by one or many, or howsoever, if it be one of the Church's contingent attributes, it is all; certainly it is no necessary property, much less comes it into the definition and essence of it" (Hales' *Tracts*, p. 198, 1721). "Marks and Notes to know the Church there are none, except we will make true profession, which is the form and essence of the Church, to be a mark. And as there are none, so it is not necessary there should be, . . . for glorious things are in the Scriptures spoken of the Church, not that I should run up and down the world to find the persons of the professors, but that I should make myself of it. This I do by taking upon me the profession of Christianity, and submitting myself to the rules of belief and practice delivered in the Gospel, though, besides myself, I know no other professor in the world" (*Ibid.* p. 197).

Concerning the Power of the Keys he thus expresses himself:—"The managing or application of the Keys, so far forth as men are entrusted with them, is *the manifestation of the doctrine* of the Gospel" (*Ibid.* p. 131). "Every one, of what state or condition soever, that hath any occasion offered him to serve another in the ways of life, clergy or lay, male or female, whatever he be, hath these Keys, not only for himself, but for the benefit of others" (*Ibid.* p. 147). "When the Apostles took order to ordain some, upon whom the public burden of preaching the Gospel should lie, it was not their purpose to impropriate the thing to those persons alone; but knowing that what was left to the care of all, was commonly worse looked unto, in wise and

most Christian care they designed some whose duty it should be to wait upon the Gospel alone, the better to preserve the profession to the world's end" (*Ibid.* p. 150). "He that is conscientious of his sin (and without trouble of conscience I think none would ever repair to his Confessor) knows very well that there is no sin so great, but upon submission GOD both can and will pardon it; and none so small but pardon for it must be sought, or else he hath been ill catechized. And more than this, what can any Priest tell him? Your Pliny somewhere tells you (*Hist. Nat.* l. 28, c. 10), that he that is stricken by a scorpion, if he go immediately and whisper it into the ear of an ass, shall find himself immediately eased. That sin is a scorpion, and bites deadly, I have always believed; but that to cure the bite of it, it was a sovereign remedy to whisper it in the ears of an [ ], a Priest, I do as well believe as I do that of Pliny" (*Ibid.* p. 154). "You may as well make your muleteer (if you have one) your Confessor, as your Parish Priest" (*Ibid.* p. 156).

In his *Tract on Schism*, we find these words:—"It hath been the common disease of Christians from the beginning, not to content themselves with that measure of faith which GOD and the Scriptures have expressly afforded us; but upon pretence of Church Authority, which is none, or Tradition, which for the most part is but figment, they have peremptorily concluded, and confidently imposed upon others a necessity of entertaining conclusions of which we can have no light, neither from Reason nor Revelation; and to strengthem themselves have broken out into divisions and factions. . . . Hence arose those ancient and many separations amongst Christians occasioned by Arianism, Eutychianism, Nestorianism, Photinianism, Sabellianism, and many more, both ancient and in our time; all which indeed are but names of *Schism*, howsoever in the common language of the Fathers, they were called *Heresies*. For Heresy is an act of the will, not of reason, and is indeed a lie, not a mistake. . . . But can any man avouch that Arius and Nestorius, and others that taught erroneously concerning the TRINITY, or the Person of our LORD, did maliciously invent what they taught, and not rather fall upon it by error and mistake. Till that be done, and that upon good evidence, we will think no worse of all parties than needs we must, and take these rents in the Church to be at the worst but *schism* upon matter of opinion. . . . I do not yet see that *opinionum varietas et opinantium veritas* are ἀσύστατα; or that men of different opinions in Christian religion may not hold communion *in sacris*, and both go to one Church. Why may not I go, if occasion require, to an Arian Church, so there be no

Arianism expressed in their Liturgy[1]? And were Liturgies and public forms of service so framed as that they admitted not of particular and private fancies, but contained only such things as those in which all Christians do agree, Schisms on opinion were utterly vanished. For consider of all the Liturgies that are or ever have been, and remove from them whatever is scandalous to any party, and leave nothing but what all agree on; and the event shall be that the Public Service and Honour of God shall no ways suffer. . . . Prayer, Confession, Thanksgiving, reading of Scriptures, exposition of Scripture, Administration of Sacraments in the plainest and simplest manner, were matter enough to furnish out a sufficient liturgy, though nothing either of private opinion, or of Church pomp, of garments, of prescribed gestures, of imagery, of music, of matters concerning the dead, of many superfluities which creep into the Churches under the name of Order and Decency, did interpose itself. For to charge churches and liturgies with things unnecessary, was the first beginning of all superstition; and when scruples of conscience began to be made or pretended, then *schisms* began to break in. If the spiritual guides and Fathers of the Church would be a little sparing of encumbering churches with superfluities, and not over rigid either in reviving obsolete customs or imposing new, there were far less danger of schism or superstition" (*Ibid.* pp. 180—184).

[1] This opinion was adopted by Hoadly (*Answer to Dr. Hare's Sermon*), whose words are quoted in support of his own by Paley, in his reply to Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Randolph, *On Subscription to Articles of Faith*:—"If a Christian can think it an intolerable thing to worship one God through one Mediator Jesus Christ, in company with any such as differ from him in their notions about the metaphysical nature of Christ, or of the Holy Ghost, or the like, I am sorry for it." Paley says: "The question concerning the Object of Worship is attended, I confess, with difficulty; it seems almost directly to divide the worshippers. But let the Church pare down her excrescences till she comes to this question; let her discharge from her liturgy controversies unconnected with devotion; let her try what may be done for all sides by worshipping God in that generality of expression in which He Himself has left some points; let her dismiss many of her Articles, and convert those which she retains into terms of peace; let her recall the terrors she suspended over freedom of inquiry; let the toleration she allows to Dissenters be made 'absolute;' let her invite men to search the Scriptures; let her governors encourage the studious and learned of all persuasions; let her do this, and she will be secure of the thanks of her own Clergy; and, what is more, of their sincerity. A greater consent may grow out of inquiry than many at present are aware of; and the few who after all shall think it necessary to recede from our communion will acknowledge the necessity to be inevitable, will respect the equity and moderation of the Established Church, and live at peace with all its members."

In his Tract on *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* he strongly contends against the necessity of any form of consecration of the elements, and then observes, that were the words of institution "quite omitted, certainly thus much good would follow, that some part (though not a little one) of the superstition that adheres to that action, by reason of an ungrounded conceit of the necessity and force of the words in it, would forthwith peel off and fall away" (p. 46). He afterwards thus sums up his own opinions of the nature of the Sacrament:—"1. In the Communion there is nothing given but Bread and Wine. 2. The Bread and Wine are signs indeed, but not of any thing there exhibited, but of somewhat given long since, even of CHRIST given for us upon the Cross, sixteen hundred years ago, and more. 3. JESUS CHRIST is eaten at the Communion Table in no sense, neither spiritually by virtue of any thing done there, nor really; neither metaphorically, nor literally. Indeed, that which is eaten (I mean the Bread) is called CHRIST by a metaphor, but it is eaten truly and properly. 4. The spiritual eating of CHRIST is common to all places as well as the LORD'S Table. *Last of all*, the uses and ends of the LORD'S Supper can be no more than such as are mentioned in the Scriptures, and they are but two. (1) The Commemoration of the Death and Passion of the SON of GOD specified by Himself at the Institution of the Ceremony. (2) To testify our union with CHRIST, and communion one with another; which end S. Paul hath taught us" (*Ibid.* p. 56).

It has been thought advisable to give these lengthy extracts from Hales because Latitudinarianism was first introduced into England by him, and because the opinions expressed in them have been consistently maintained by its followers ever since his time. This will appear in the sequel. But in the meantime the reader may rely on having before him an authentic statement of the principal points of the system, in the words of its first English professor. One of its earliest disciples of any eminence was William Chillingworth[1], an intimate friend of

[1] It is however only fair to Chillingworth to state that there are various passages in his works but little accordant with the system with which his name is commonly associated. The following extract, for instance, from his seventh Sermon, on S. Luke xix. 8, would sound somewhat startling if delivered by a Latitudinarian Divine of the present day, and could not, one would think, have been much relished by those of the same class of his own time:—

"Since Christ, for your benefit and comfort, hath given such authority to His Ministers, upon your unfeigned repentance and contrition, to absolve

Hales, who on his return from the Roman Communion, which he had been led to join, wrote a book entitled *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way of Salvation*, of which it has been said by Coleridge that its "main position, that the mere text of the Bible is the sole and exclusive ground of Christian faith and practice, is quite untenable against the Romanists. It entirely destroys the conditions of a Church, of an authority residing in a religious community, and all that holy sense of brotherhood which is so sublime and consolatory to a meditative Christian" (*Table Talk*, vol. i. p. 240. 1835). This notion of the all-sufficiency of Scripture, explained by each man for himself according to the dictates of his own private judgment, appears to have been the fundamental principle of the party, that from which all their other peculiarities took their rise, leading them to reject the system of the Church, the importance of primitive testimony to the right interpretation of Holy Writ, and many doctrines, especially those connected with the Priesthood and

and release you from your sins, why should I doubt or be unwilling to exhort and persuade you to make your advantage of this gracious promise of our Saviour? Truly, if I should thus deal with you, I should prove myself a malicious, unchristianlike, malignant preacher; I should wickedly and unjustly, against my own conscience, seek to defraud you of those glorious blessings which our Saviour hath intended for you.

"Therefore, in obedience to His gracious will, and as I am warranted, and even enjoined, by my holy mother the Church of England expressly, in the Book of Common Prayer, in the Rubric of Visiting the Sick (which doctrine this Church hath likewise embraced so far), I beseech you, that by your practice and use, you will not suffer that commission which Christ hath given to His Ministers to be a vain form of words, without any sense under them; to be an antiquated, expired commission, of no use nor validity in these days; but whensoever you find yourselves charged and oppressed, especially with such crimes as they call *peccata vastantia conscientiam*, such as do lay waste and depopulate the conscience, that you would have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignancy of your disease, that he may be able, as the cause shall require, to proportion a remedy, either to search it with corrosives, or comfort and temper it with oil. And come not to him only with such a mind as you would go to a learned man experienced in the Scriptures, as one that can speak comfortable, quieting words to you, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from God Himself, to absolve and acquit you of your sins. If you shall do this, assure your souls that the understanding of man is not able to conceive that transport and excess of joy and comfort which shall accrue to that man's heart, that is persuaded that he hath been made partaker of His blessing, orderly and legally, according as our Saviour Christ hath prescribed."

This author also wrote an able and closely-reasoned Tract, entitled *The Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy Demonstrated.*

the Sacraments, which have been uniformly professed by Catholic Christians. They not unnaturally adopted Erastian views of the power of the Civil Authority in the spiritual affairs of the Church, and although they supported the cause of Charles I., yet were they instrumental in bringing about the dethronement of James II. and the coming to the Crown of William of Orange, to which the more Orthodox and Catholic members of the Church, both Clergy and Laity, were generally opposed. Hence, for many years after this event, theirs was the party in favour with the higher powers, from which men were usually chosen to fill the more eminent and influential positions in the Church. This was attended with many unhappy consequences. In spite of the vigorous efforts of the Clergy in Convocation to sustain the tone of both Church principles and other Catholic doctrine, the Church, as a body, seemed at length almost to have lost the consciousness (though of course it survived in many individuals, who did what they could to keep it alive, and to arouse her again to a sense of it) of her true nature, and of the powers with which she had been furnished by her Divine Head. Her Provincial Synods were no longer suffered to assemble, because the members of one of them—that of Canterbury—had attempted to censure for heresy one of her prelates, who was in favour with the Government of the day, and was afterwards raised, apparently as an insult to her, from one See to another until he attained to the third, after the Archbishopries, in the realm.

That man, Hoadly, "the lowest-minded of all low-minded men," seems, however, to have been rightly appreciated and thoroughly despised, even by those to whom he owed his elevation. "My lord," said George II. to Lord Harvey, "I am very sorry you choose your friends so ill, but I cannot help saying, if the Bishop of Winchester is your friend, you have a great puppy, and a very dull fellow, and a great rascal for your friend. It is a very pretty thing for such scoundrels, when they are raised by favour so much above their deserts, to be talking and writing their stuff, to give trouble to the Government which has showed them that favour; and very modest in a canting, hypocritical knave to be crying, 'The Kingdom of Christ is not of this world[1],' at the same time that he, as Christ's Ambassador, receives 6000*l.* or 7000*l.* a year. But he is just the same thing in the Church that he is in the Government, and as ready to receive the best pay for preaching the

[1] The text of his famous sermon before George I., which the Convocation were engaged in censuring when they were arbitrarily silenced.

Bible, though he does not believe a word of it, as he is to take favours from the Crown, though by his republican spirit and doctrine he would be glad to abolish its power[1]." Under such influence and auspices, the sound Catholic teaching which had, since the Reformation, hitherto mainly characterized the Church of England, the teaching of Hooker, and Andrewes, and Laud, and Taylor, and Pearson, and Bull, and others of like principles, went out of fashion and became gradually superseded by that of Burnet, and Tillotson, and Clarke, and Balguy, and Powell. The language of Holy Scripture was frittered away, and declared to be destitute of application to the present state of the world, at least amongst Christians. "The patrons," says Paley,—after having quoted the words, "born again of GOD and the SPIRIT," "dead to sin," "alive from the dead," "buried with CHRIST in Baptism, and raised together with Him"—"the patrons of a more sober exposition have been often challenged, and sometimes confounded, with the question—If such expressions of Scripture do not mean this, what do they mean? To which we answer, Nothing: nothing, that is, to us; nothing to be found or sought for in the present circumstances of Christianity[2]." And side by side with this change in religious teaching, there took place a lamentable decline in general learning. "Learning," said Bishop Warburton, "is, in England, in a most deplorable condition. The books which daily come out are either miserable common-place collections on the one hand, which are called learning, or are the extravagant whimsies and paradoxes on the other, which are called science."

However, conjointly with the neglect or denial of those principles which relate to the constitution and ordinances of the Church, an indifference to other doctrines though divinely revealed, very widely prevailed amongst her professed members. The motives of the Gospel were urged with comparative infrequency, or kept in the background; a low standard was set forth for the direction of the heart and conduct, embracing little more than a decent morality; scepticism and infidelity became common, and intemperance and licentiousness abounded. Any approach to Christian strictness, earnestness, and zeal was regarded with suspicion or denounced as hypocrisy, even by those whose especial duty it was to encourage and direct them. And

[1] Lord Harvey's *Memoirs*, vol. ii. p. 47, quoted in Archdeacon Wilberforce's *Sketch of the History of Erastianism*.

[2] *Caution recommended in the Use and Application of Scriptural Language:* a Sermon preached July 17, 1777, at the Visitation of the Bishop of Carlisle.

so, when at length some men's hearts were touched with a real concern for the eternal welfare of themselves and their fellow-creatures, instead of being guided and counselled and sobered and restrained by those in authority, as they naturally required to be, they were treated with insult and opposition, and virtually driven from the fold of the Church, which thus lost multitudes of members, who might probably by a wiser and gentler management have been retained within, to do her work.

There were others, however, who, revolted, like the former, by the worldliness, deadness, unbelief, and profligacy which they saw around them, and appalled at the destruction of immortal souls which they seemed to imply, turned their attention in like manner to those doctrines which, from their direct bearing on personal salvation, seemed most calculated to rouse men from their spiritual slumber, and without accepting what may be called the Church's *distinctive* teaching, were yet content to abide in her communion. These individuals were "too much inclined to classify the Christian doctrines in a minutely graduated scale, and to fix the importance of each according to the precise degree in which its bearing on the personal acceptance of men is direct and obvious" (Gladstone's *Church Principles*, p. 467). Though they were far from denying, yet they failed to appreciate at their full value, those points expressed in the Nicene Creed respecting the nature of the GODHEAD, while they dwelt almost exclusively on the Fall of Man, the Atonement, Justification by Faith, and Sanctification by the HOLY SPIRIT. They seem, indeed, to have mainly grafted the inculcation of these doctrines on the system of the Latitudinarians; for, like them, they denied the Church's doctrine of the Priesthood and the Sacraments, and, like them, had a leaning to the theory of Erastianism. Thus Dr. Powell, a distinguished Latitudinarian divine at Cambridge, in 1756, maintained in a theological disputation the essential indifference of all forms of Church Government, and especially that neither the form adopted by the Church of England, nor that of the Kirk of Scotland, was contrary to either the natural rights of man, or to the Word of GOD. And some years later, Charles Simeon, a leading Evangelical of the same University, acted upon this notion by taking part ministerially, when in Scotland, in a 'Sacramental' Service of the Establishment, and justifying himself on the plea that if the Sovereign were in Scotland, and desired to attend public worship in his official character, it must be that of the same body.

These religionists, however, were certainly instrumental in turning men's minds to a consideration of various Truths of Religion which had been much overlooked, and in arousing

within them a sense of the necessity of living to God, and making their everlasting welfare their first object. But their teaching caused their followers to rely too much on their feelings, to make light of all means of grace of which they could not perceive the immediate use and effect, to estimate lightly a quiet, unostentatious, self-denying discharge of daily practical duties, and to seek continually for religious excitement, and to be uneasy and dissatisfied unless they could appeal to their own inward experiences as a proof of their justification and acceptance in the sight of God. It must be obvious that such a system, from the very partial nature of the truth which it included, from the principle of sight and sensation on which it rested, from the scanty nourishment it afforded to the mind and intellect, and from the spirit of selfishness which it had a tendency to foster, would prove most unsatisfactory to men of thought, ability, and refinement; and so it is believed that it would be impossible to name a single *great* theologian among all its adherents. It was, therefore, naturally to be expected that, as in Germany the school of Pietists was succeeded by that of Rationalists, so persons of superior mental powers, who from the accidents of birth, or education, or any other association, found themselves connected with the system before us, unless they supplied its deficiencies and corrected its extravagances, by accepting in full that of the Church, should in time recur to that which it had in some measure superseded.

We have accordingly seen the revival of this Latitudinarian System in our own day. And the characteristics of its chief supporters cannot be better described, allowing, of course, for the altered circumstances of the times, than in words used more than thirty years ago to pourtray their predecessors in the early part of the last century :—" They were acute and clear, and maintained the low ground on which they stood with remarkable dexterity and shrewdness. Terse and finished in their style, compact and clear within their own sphere, they never went beyond it. Content to dwell in decencies for ever, comprehensive views, courageous defence of high grounds, enthusiastic or even affectionate devotion to a great cause, is not to be expected from them . . . But the natural effect of renouncing high views one's self is to suspect or ridicule them in others. They who dare to hold them are considered as unreasonable, bigoted, impracticable; and what is called *common sense*, but what is, in good truth, a slavish and deliberate choice of low views instead of high ones, is made the guide of practice and the object of imitation. A good deal of

humour is not an unfrequent attendant of this calm and cautious condition of mind, and this is used as freely in ridiculing what are considered the overstrained views of friends, as the falsehoods of foes. The inevitable consequence of this is a most unwholesome tone of mind, disposed to consider every thing which is not common-place as extravagant; every thing bold as rash; every thing generous as foolish; every thing like inflexible adherence to principle as bigotry and violence. To fight for principle, in the eyes of such persons, can arise only from madness or wickedness; and they use the warfare of ridicule or censure accordingly.

"If we wish for any proof of this, and of the harm done by it, let us look to the notions entertained as to Church Government, in the present day, which are to be ascribed wholly to these writers. Hooker, and Hall, Sanderson, and Pearson, and Leslie, dwelt with the utmost earnestness on the Episcopal Office and the Ministerial Commission, as *necessary* for the due possession of the Sacraments by the people. They taught plainly that Priests were nothing *by themselves,* that their value is derived from their *office,* and from the commission to minister in their Master's Name which that office gives, and that laws can no more make a Priest than they can make a Sacrament. And Hooker, and Hall, and Pearson, and Leslie, were not thought either ignorant, or foolish, or extravagant. But when the new school had possession of the divinity of the Church, and such men as Hoadly of its high stations, Hooker, and Hall, and Pearson, and Leslie, were corrected by Balguy and Powell, and taught that one form is just as good as another; that the Church is a sort of club, which must have some laws and some orders, because even a club cannot go on well without, but that the laws of one club are as good as those of another. They were taught that the directions of the Apostles, and the constant and undisputed practice of the whole Church of Christ for fifteen centuries, cannot be of any consequence, if *we* think in our wisdom that a Church can subsist without a Bishop, and a Priest without ordination; that the State can manufacture Ministers of God's Word at its own pleasure, and after its own fashion; and that they are fully qualified to dispense the Word of Life and the Sacraments of the Gospel. Talk to too many Churchmen, and find whether this is not too often their notion. Consider how such miserable degradation entered at all into the Church, which once heard the truth from Hooker and Pearson, and be assured that it was let down by degrees through this clever, low-minded race of divines, who made it their boast and pride to

take what they called the *common-sense* and *tangible* view of every question, and laughed down every one who believed and taught that there are things which we can neither touch, nor taste, nor handle, as necessary to our spiritual life as the air we breathe, and as true as the truth of GOD" (*The Study of Church History recommended,* by Hugh James Rose, B.D., 1834, pp. 51—54).

The writer who was chiefly instrumental in bringing this style of divinity again into fashion amongst us, was the late Dr. Arnold. But all that he did was simply to re-assert, in pleasing and elegant language, the opinions of the previous century, without being able to add any thing either to them or to the arguments by which they were sought to be enforced. Accordingly, in the year 1835, the Rev. H. H. Norris, of Hackney, (it is believed,) reprinted two of Law's *Letters to Bishop Hoadly,* submitting them "to the consideration of the Rev. Dr. Arnold and his readers, for the double purpose of disabusing the one of his erroneous views on the subject of Church Government, and of proving to the others that those errors have neither the charm of novelty nor the force of truth." Indeed the absence of novelty is a remarkable characteristic of the writings of the school revived by him. The celebrated volume, *Essays and Reviews,* contains scarcely any thing which had not been exposed and reprehended between thirty and forty years before its appearance, in the work of the Rev. H. J. Rose on the *State of Protestantism in Germany.*

It may, however, be as well for the reader to have before him an authentic statement of the opinions professed by the modern school of Latitudinarians, and for this purpose he is presented with the following extracts from Dr. Arnold's posthumous volume *On the Church.* "I have shown," he says, "that as the Christian Ministry is not a Priesthood, as they neither possess nor can transmit any personal superiority, whether of holiness or of knowledge, there can be conceived no reason why they should constitute an exception to the general rule of all society; that the form of its government is fixed by law, a law in its origin framed by man, but becoming, in its power of requiring obedience, the law of GOD, because GOD, in such matters, having given no express ordinance of His own by Revelation, has vouchsafed His sanction to the ordinances of society, to prevent the mischiefs of individual lawlessness" (p. 79).

Again:—Bishops are said to have ceased to be representatives of the Apostles, and to have a right to claim the promises made to them, because they are not in possession of their miraculous gifts (p. 86).

The following is a remarkable admission :—"That first false principle," *i. e.* of the Divine constitution of the Church, and of the Apostolical succession, "is all but coeval with the origin of Christianity; it has obtained such a hold on men's minds and on their language," &c. (p. 99).

The true remedy of Dissent in this country is asserted to be "An enlarged constitution of the Christian Church of England, which is the State of England."

"*Superstitious and fanatical Objection* :—That the Church is distinct from the State, and independent of it, having a divinely appointed government of its own.

"*Answer* :—The State in a Christian country is the Church, and therefore has much to do with religion. The Church, as such, has no divinely appointed government."

"All ministerial power," it is afterwards stated, "is derived from the body of the Church, *i. e.* from the laity, or, in other words, from the State."

"The perfection of Christian doctrine," we are told, "consisted in clearly understanding that CHRIST's Death had rendered all Priesthoods, Sacrifices, and Ceremonies, for the time to come, unimportant" (p. 56).

Again :—"It is not rationalism but reason resting on faith, which assures us of the utter incapacity of any outward bodily action to produce in us an inward spiritual effect" (p. 83).

With this may be compared the following words from Hoadly's *Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-jurors* :—"When you are secure of your integrity before GOD, this will lead you (as it ought all of us) not to be afraid of the terrors of men, or the vain words of regular and uninterrupted successions, authoritative benediction, excommunications—nullity or validity of GOD's ordinances to the people, upon account of *niceties* and *trifles*, or any other the like *dreams*."

Accordingly it is denied by Dr. Arnold that Divine appointment to a spiritual office implies a succession, and the value of such an appointment is made to consist solely in the personal character and qualifications of the officers (pp. 70—73). Jewish rites, again, are placed on a par with Christian Sacraments (p. 78), and "GOD's grace" is said to be "conveyed by these latter morally, because the joining CHRIST's Church in the first instance, and the constantly refreshing our communion with it afterwards, are actions highly beneficial to our moral nature" (p. 63).

"The whole importance of Baptism," Dr. Arnold thinks, "in S. Barnabas' eyes," whose sentiments, as expressed in the Epistle attributed to him, Dr. Arnold is endeavouring to repre-

sent as coincident with his own, "must have consisted in the real change of heart which it implied, and the change of life of which it was the beginning; and that the ceremony of baptizing with water was merely a symbol of the great and important change which a man underwent in passing from a state of heathenism to Christianity" (p. 62).

He gives the following account of the Holy Eucharist:—"When Christians met together and received the Bread and Wine of their common living as the Body and Blood of CHRIST, such an act had a real tendency to strengthen and confirm their souls, and the HOLY SPIRIT made such a communion a constant means of grace to those who partook of it. But here there was no place for the Priest; on the one side there was CHRIST'S Church assembled, on the other there was CHRIST and His SPIRIT to bless them. . . . The Bread and Wine became the Sacraments of CHRIST'S Body and Blood by the assembled Church receiving them as such; by their converting an act of nature into an act of religion; by their agreeing to partake together, as of their earthly food, so also of their spiritual, and thus being joined to one another in CHRIST. The agreement, therefore, of those communicating, their common faith and love, constitute the real consecration of the Bread and Wine; and it is this which, through CHRIST'S SPIRIT, changes the Supper into the Sacrament" (pp. 20, 21).

Again:—"The Holy Communion was intended to keep in memory the Death of our LORD, and through our memory to strengthen our faith, and *so* to make us actually and personally partakers of the benefits of His Death" (p. 97).

It must strike every one, on consideration, that the sentiments contained in these extracts are a mere repetition of those of Hales, given above, which were afterwards set forth with more or less plausibility by various writers, and amongst others by Dr. Balguy in his two sermons (the 6th and 7th) on Church Authority, and his Seventh Charge, 'On the Sacraments.' Dr. Arnold quotes different passages of Scripture in support of his notions, but of these it is sufficient to say that *he thinks* such to be their meaning, in opposition to other expositors at least as well qualified to judge as he was, and to the entire authority of the Christian Church from the time of its foundation. He also endeavours to torture certain expressions of the early Fathers into accordance with his views; but at the same time utterly disclaims the idea of attaching to their judgment or testimony the slightest weight or importance. Indeed he appears to carry the exercise

of 'private judgment' to its utmost possible extent, for it cannot be perceived that he regards any one's opinion as entitled to consideration but his own. Thus he speaks of the fifth Book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, as that "from which so many unwise and unfair arguments have been quoted as the words of impartiality and wisdom" (p. 81); and scruples not to apply violent and abusive language, with the imputation of the worst motives, to those who upheld the principles which he so vehemently controverts. It is true, he refers to the Articles and Liturgy (p. 97) as if they were contradicted by those against whom he is arguing, but it will be seen with what consistency, when, speaking in condemnatory terms of the Roman Clergy at the time that the German chiefs broke up the Empire, he says:—"They called themselves *Priests;* and consistently with the same professed that they were empowered and exclusively commissioned to offer sacrifice for the people, and to forgive their sins" (p. 64) : as if the term *Priests* (not simply *Presbyter*, but *Sacerdos*,) did not occur in our Liturgy or Articles[1], and there was no recognition of any exclusive power in those to whom it is applied, to offer Sacrifice, or forgive sins.

But indeed the whole system we are now considering is so entirely opposed to that of the Church of England, that we are surprised how any can adopt it, and yet continue in her Ministry, or even in her Communion. She expresses in her various formularies and documents the utmost deference to the authority of the Primitive Church, the ancient Councils, and the judgment of the early Fathers. The principle of a Sacerdotal Order of Divine Appointment, continued in unbroken succession from the times of the Apostles, and of grace dispensed through the ordinances which they are empowered to administer, pervades all her offices. Take, for instance, the words with which a Bishop is consecrated, when "the Archbishop and Bishops present lay their hands upon his head:" "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; In the Name, &c. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God *which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands*, &c." Or again, the words used at the ordination of a Priest, when "the Bishop with the Priests present lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the Order of Priesthood:" "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest

[1] See the title in Latin of Article xxxii., which is of equal authority with the English.

in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments; In the Name, &c."

And now let us see how this holy commission is to be exercised. In the Visitation of the Sick, "the sick person is to be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left Power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins. In the Name, &c. Amen.'" And what is the nature of those Sacraments, "generally necessary to salvation," which the Priesthood are empowered to administer? They "be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and *effectual* signs of grace and God's good will towards us, *by the which He doth work invisibly in us*, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him" (Article xxv.). In accordance with this definition, in the Office for the Ministration of Private Baptism, the child is declared "by Baptism regenerate," *i.e.* as is plain from a previous prayer in the same office, "born again, and made an heir of everlasting Salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church:" while, in the Holy Communion we are taught to pray that our gracious Lord would "grant us so to eat the Flesh of His dear Son Jesus Christ, and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood"—a petition which distinctly implies that They may be eaten and drunk by us in such a way as to render us 'in no wise partakers of Christ,' or of any spiritual Benefit flowing from Him, but rather of guilt and condemnation from the profanation of so great and sacred a Mystery.

Such passages as these from the Formularies of the Church of England might be multiplied almost indefinitely. Those that are quoted, are brought forward merely as a specimen of the general character of the Church's system, sufficient to show its irreconcilable opposition to that of the Latitudinarians as displayed in the extracts already given. Indeed this has been painfully felt by many members of that party, who have in consequence made earnest and vigorous efforts to be relieved from the necessity of

declaring their assent to the Prayer Book and Articles. The system, in fact, can never be said to have found a *home* within the Church. Even when, through the patronage of the Civil Power, it prevailed most extensively, it was always perceived to be of a nature alien to that of the body wherein it was found, affecting it simply as a disease, reducing it to comparative inactivity, and grievously impairing its influence for the objects which it was instituted to effect.

But the very first principle of Latitudinarianism seems at variance with a due regard to GOD'S Revelation. Its avowed aim is to reduce the necessary articles of faith to the smallest number, and to bring down their importance to the lowest degree, in order to include as many as possible within the Christian Communion. This, however, is evidently to show more regard to man than to GOD, to be more anxious about our union with our fellow-creatures than about the presence of the Truth which He has made known, to set the second of the two great commandments, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," above the first, "Thou shalt love the LORD thy GOD with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength;" for if we endeavour so to love Him, we shall assuredly be most careful that not one jot, nor one tittle of His Revelation be overlooked or neglected, however displeasing it may become to those with whom we would be most gladly associated. The blessedness, too, of believing what has but *probable* evidence of having come from Him, without waiting for certain assurance, is touchingly shown in our LORD'S reproof of S. Thomas who was 'doubtful in His Resurrection;' "Thomas, because thou hast seen Me thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed:" whilst the jealousy we are to show in behalf of the truth, and against those by whom any portion of it is impugned or denied, may be safely inferred from a remarkable passage written by the same Apostle who has recorded our SAVIOUR'S Words to S. Thomas:—"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him GOD speed[1]: for he that biddeth him GOD speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." We are accordingly required by another Apostle "earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the Saints" (S. Jude 3), *i.e.* not merely for this or that point of it, but for *the whole*.

[1] 2 S. John 10. Χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε. Χαίρειν was, in those days, the ordinary form of salutation.

We are not, therefore, at liberty to select one or two Doctrines, which by the light of our own private opinion seem to us calculated to produce the most beneficial effects, and to leave the others as matters of indifference. They may be highly important both in themselves and in their results, though we should be unable to point out in what consists their importance. At any rate, we may be sure they would not have been revealed had there not been some purpose for them to fulfil; and it is simple presumption and impiety, to set up our estimation of their importance against Him Who has thought fit to make them known. Moreover, if we feel ourselves at liberty to dispense with this or that as unnecessary, we can have no right to find fault with others who use the same freedom with regard to doctrines which *we* think it important to retain; and thus the whole body of revealed truth may be frittered away, without any solid ground being left on which to stand for its defence. Nor is this any imaginary consequence. From such a use of his private judgment, "Mr. Blanco White, after he had renounced the errors of the Roman Catholic religion, was prevented, in the first instance, from acquiescing implicitly in any of the established forms of orthodox Protestantism; and then gradually urged forward, without the power of discovering any other resting-place, first, to a Latitudinarian conviction that no single definite belief respecting the object of religious faith was better or more pleasing to God than any other; and, finally, to a full adoption, which, however, he held to be a matter of indifference, of the Socinian Creed" ("Remarks on the Grounds of Orthodox Belief," in Froude's *Remains*, part ii. vol. i. pp. 315, 316).

The judgment which those we are considering form, in the first instance, with regard to the relative importance of doctrines and points of belief, is regulated, as we have said, by their *obvious* tendency to affect the heart and feelings, and to influence the life; and the same criterion do they use in estimating the comparative value of the different means of grace. In some cases they form their opinions from feelings alone, which they fancy to be the result of the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit; and in others, from the natural connexion between cause and effect, of which their own intelligence enables them to judge. Thus, it is not difficult to see how a man may be affected by instruction, exhortation, warning, or encouragement; and therefore Sermons, if able and impressive, are highly appreciated. But we are not ordinarily conscious of any effects produced in us by Prayer, beyond a solemnizing of the mind, an increased sense of our dependence upon God, and of thankfulness to Him,

with an enlarged feeling of love and benevolence towards our fellow-creatures, for whom, as well as ourselves, our petitions have been offered. We are able to see that the exercise and cultivation of such feelings may serve to recommend us to GOD'S favour and tend to our own improvement, and so in that we place the chief efficacy of prayer. We have a difficulty in conceiving how His Providence can be influenced by our requests, and therefore the idea of obtaining any thing directly from Him, in consequence of them, takes but faint hold of us, and enters slightly into our appreciation of it.

And in like manner with respect to the Sacraments. Their principal value is made to consist in the impression they produce on us of the facts they are intended to symbolize and commemorate. That can be understood; but as there is no *apparent* connexion between "visible elements" and "invisible grace," nor any *evident* reason why a blessing bestowed upon the former should be more efficacious from the lips of certain men than of others, neither morally nor intellectually inferior to them, or, in fact, why a blessing should make in them any difference at all, it is considered quite impossible that they should in any case avail to the infusion of supernatural influence, or not be equally beneficial by whomsoever administered. Thus they are only profitable inasmuch as they tend to stir up and encourage holy and pious feelings, to raise our hearts in adoration and thankfulness to GOD, and to foster sentiments of love and good-will to our fellow-Christians; and no value is attributed to any Divine commission for their administration, seeing such effects are as likely to follow without it as with. And so men reverse the Apostolic rule, *and walk by sight, not by faith*. And as they will only trust *experience* in their appreciation of the means of grace and edification, so it is not to be wondered at, nay, it is only a natural consequence, that the *absence* of experience should lead them to the denial of the miraculous and supernatural altogether, should make them endeavour to account for miracles and prodigies by the influence of natural causes, to attribute them to some illusion of the senses, or some unknown property of the elements, or even, where this is impossible, to reject the narratives of Scripture as untrue. Of course, too, it is but a simple following out of the same principle, when the union of the Divine and Human Natures in the PERSON of our Incarnate LORD is treated as a myth, and the Doctrine of the TRINITY in UNITY denounced as a corruption.

Now all this follows from a rejection of the Authority of the Church—the body founded by our LORD, organized by His

Apostles, and perpetuated under the same form of government by their successors, as a witness either as to what doctrines were held from the beginning, or what interpretation of Holy Scripture was universally received by her members. "With the FATHER of Lights is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." "JESUS CHRIST is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." It follows, therefore, that what was necessary to be believed at the commencement of Christianity, is necessary now; and what that is, we know from the testimony of the Church. It seems also to follow, even as a deduction of *common sense*, that that sense of Holy Scripture should be received as true, which has been handed down to us from those who were familiar with its writers, and prevailed for ages throughout the Church, without any recorded expression of doubt or objection from any who were esteemed its true members. It was on these principles that the decisions of the first General Council were framed. In the year of our LORD 325, three hundred and eighteen Bishops assembled at Nicæa from all parts of the Christian world, to report what doctrines had been maintained in their Churches from their origin, and what meaning had been attached to certain Scriptural declarations; and in accordance with their report was the Creed drawn up and promulgated, which bears the name of the city where they were convened.

But all this is to go for nothing. Such a mode of proceeding, though universally assented to by the wisest and holiest of GOD'S people for at least 1500 years, betrays a blind and servile submission to the testimony of Antiquity and the claims of Ecclesiastical Authority, takes no account of the fresh illumination that is ever beaming on the human understanding, and ill accords with the spirit of these days of enlightenment and liberality. The Bible alone, irrespective of any interpretation received through any human means, is to each individual the sole guide of faith, the sole rule of discipline and morals. No matter that the most opposite conclusions are drawn from its pages by persons of apparently equal qualifications, intellectual and spiritual. Let each one embrace that which commends itself most to his private understanding; and doubtless, if it be held in sincerity, it will be equally beneficial to himself and acceptable to Him by Whom the Revelation was given, with the opposite one held by his neighbour.

We are aware, indeed, that not all who profess to adopt this maxim of the all-sufficiency of Scripture, will accept the consequence which, under actual circumstances, appears to us to

flow from it. We see not, however, how they can consistently hold back. We see not how they can find fault with another, who has the same opportunities of judging as themselves, for deriving from the Bible principles or opinions totally contrary to their own, or presume that, in consequence of holding them, he is less in favour with its Divine Author than themselves. There are those indeed (we fear an increasing number), who stop not short of this conclusion; and though it appears to us, by denying the importance of all objective articles of faith, to do away with the value of a revelation and render it useless, we cannot but allow them the merit of having followed out a principle to its logical consequence. Nor are we surprised if any, who reject the testimony of the Church as to the Interpretation of Scripture, be led to put it also aside with regard to the books which constitute Scripture; and decide this point for themselves according to the notions they may entertain of what are the fitting characteristics of a work professing to be written by Inspiration of GOD. Nay, what is there to prevent all idea of supernatural Inspiration being discarded, and the Bible being looked upon as a collection of Tracts, preserved to us indeed by the Providence of GOD, but to be judged of, like other books, according to their respective contents?

We have seen then that the denial of the authority of the Church, and the consequent rejection of its testimony, not only leave us in doubt as to the Articles of Faith which we are required to hold, not only render us, consistently, uncertain of the meaning of Holy Scripture on a variety of fundamental points, but even tend to shake our confidence in the Divine character of the books of which it is composed, or at any rate deprive us of the most solid grounds on which to rest our belief of it. "Non crederem Evangelio," said S. Augustin, "nisi me Ecclesiæ Catholicæ authoritas commoveret."

The Church has ever borne witness to the existence of a Priesthood within her; *i. e.* of a body of men commissioned by CHRIST to act for the people towards GOD, and for GOD towards the people. This they do by offering up solemn Prayers and Supplications, administering certain Rites and Ordinances, bestowing Benediction, and pronouncing sentence of Excommunication; and the Church has always considered a body of men authorized by her LORD to perform such functions, as necessary to her own existence. We have seen, however, that by the supporters of the system which we are now considering, all this is peremptorily denied, as being inconsistent with the liberty of the Gospel, and interfering with that freedom of access to the

Father which our Saviour has procured for us by His Incarnation and Death. Now, we confess at once that the reality of the Priestly character, which all allow to have existed under the Jewish Dispensation, and the validity of the acts performed in reliance on it, depend, under the Gospel, on the truth of the commission by which our Lord is alleged to have conferred it. We cannot, indeed, pretend to understand all the reasons of His conduct, so that it would be no sound objection to such an institution if we had a difficulty in reconciling it with His other acts, or with other features of the Dispensation which He came to establish. But, abstractedly considered, there seems no greater inconsistency in His appointing men to act as His deputies on earth when He should have passed into the Heavens, and in making them the vehicles of His favour and influence to their brethren, than in His appointing first Twelve, and afterwards other Seventy, while He was in the world, to discharge towards certain of the sick and afflicted those offices of healing which He fulfilled to many others in His own Person.

Let us then inquire into the words in which the Priestly authority is supposed to have been imparted. "Then said Jesus to them again, 'Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'" To which He added, on another occasion, "All power is given unto Me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (S. John xx. 21—25; S. Matt. xxviii. 18—20.). We know that many attempts have been made to assign meanings to these words different from that which of right belongs to them. But the miserable inadequacy of the explanations given, must strike every one not committed to the support of a modern system, and must, one would think, have rendered them unsatisfactory even to those by whom they were brought forward. Thus Burkitt, after many correct and edifying observations on this paragraph, concludes: "The power of forgiving sins that man hath, is only to declare, that if men be truly and really penitent, their sins are forgiven them for the sake of Christ's satisfaction." Bishop Hoadly thought that "the Apostles might possibly understand the power of remitting and retaining sins to be the same with the power of laying their

hands upon the sick" (*Works*, vol. i. p. 594); and Doddridge, who appears like Hoadly to restrict the words of our SAVIOUR to the Apostles alone [1], gives this explanation of them:—"You shall have a power, not only of declaring what is lawful or unlawful under the Gospel Dispensation, but also of sending or removing miraculous punishments, and of discerning the spirits of men in such perfection as to be able with certainty to declare to particular persons in question, whether they be, or be not, in a state of pardon and acceptance with GOD." Far more straightforward and satisfactory is the exposition of Grotius, except that he regards the act of breathing as a symbol, and the words that accompanied it, "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST," as an assurance of the spiritual gifts that were to be *afterwards* bestowed. The remission of sins he explains of the admission to Baptism of those who professed their belief with sincerity in the truths of the Gospel, and of restoration to the Communion of the Church of those who had fallen, when they had afforded satisfactory testimony of their true repentance: the retaining of sins, on the contrary, of the refusal of Baptism to those who were manifestly in unbelief, and of exclusion from the Church's Communion of those who had sinned and remained impenitent. These acts, he says, when justly performed, it is here promised that God will ratify, receiving back into His favour the penitent, and suffering the impenitent to remain under His displeasure; of which the recovery of the sick mentioned in S. James v. 14, the infliction of blindness on Elymas, and the power of Satan over the incestuous Corinthian, and Hymenæus, and Philetus, manifested apparently in some bodily disease, were respectively visible tokens.

Now it is evident that these are the functions of those who are "ordained for men in things pertaining to GOD," *i. e.* of Priests, and correspond to certain actions that appear to have been typical of them, which such persons had to perform under the Old Covenant. The HOLY GHOST, therefore, Which the Apostles now received from our LORD, was the spiritual influence necessary to give due effect to the discharge of these offices. They had been *already* empowered to work miracles, as we learn from S. Matthew x. 1; and the extraordinary Gift of the HOLY SPIRIT to enable them to speak with tongues, to enlighten them as to the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever their LORD had said unto them, was not bestowed

[1] In his note on S. Matt. xvi. 19, he implies his concurrence in the opinions maintained by Hoadly, "the present celebrated Bishop of Winchester, in his glorious controversy on the subject of Church Authority."

until the day of Pentecost. But they were now furnished with such authority and influence as were requisite for the work of the Ministry.

"As a King sending forth governors," says S. Chrysostom, "gives power to cast into prison and to deliver from it, so CHRIST, in sending these forth, invests them with the same power. . . . Some say that by breathing on them He gave not the SPIRIT, but only rendered them fit to receive It. . . . Wherefore He said not, 'Ye have received the HOLY GHOST,' but '*Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*' Yet one will not be wrong in asserting that they then also received some spiritual power and grace, not so as to raise the dead, or to work miracles, but so as to remit sins. For the Gifts of the SPIRIT are of different kinds; wherefore He added, '*Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them,*' showing what kind of power He was giving." And that this power was not meant to cease with those to whom it was originally given, is evident from the words in which it was imparted—"*As* My FATHER hath sent Me, even *so* send I you," which plainly imply the right and duty of transmitting it to others; and again—"Lo, I am with you alway," in the fulfilment, *i. e.* of the work for which the HOLY GHOST has been given to qualify you, "even unto the end of the world." We accordingly find, from Acts xx. 28, that the Presbyters of Ephesus, who had doubtless been ordained by some of the original Apostles, or others afterwards associated with them in the same Office—S. Matthias, S. Paul, and S. Barnabas—are said to have been made Bishops, or Overseers over the Flock, the Church of GOD, by the HOLY GHOST; whilst the *Sacerdotal* character of their office is still further confirmed by the fact that the very word which is employed in the New Testament to designate both our LORD'S Office in Heaven "a *Minister* of the Sanctuary," λειτουργὸς (Heb. viii. 2), and, in its verbal form, the sacrificial ministrations of a Priest under the law,—"Every Priest standeth daily *ministering*" (λειτουργῶν), and offering oftentimes the same Sacrifices (Heb. x. 11),—is also used to describe the usual functions of Christian Ministers. "Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers. . . . As they *ministered* to the LORD, &c." λειτουργούντων (Acts xiii. 1, 2).

From all this we are assured that it cannot be a matter of indifference to deny or ignore the existence of a Priesthood in the Christian Church. In fact, the principles on which this is done, if fully carried out, would lead to the denial or neglect of every thing the reason of which we could not explain, or which seemed to us inconsistent with what ought to be the character

or the provisions of the Dispensation of the Gospel. But surely if "GOD so loved the world that He gave His Only-begotten SON, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life," it was yet competent to Him, without making all clear to us, to appoint His own means by which the benefits of this wondrous Gift should be sought on our part and imparted on His. Now we have seen that, for this purpose, our LORD has established an earthly Priesthood, which He designed to continue unto the end of the world. Thus it becomes "part of what He has effected for us, just as much as the descent of the promised COMFORTER is part of this; and to object to it as implying insufficiency in the other parts of what CHRIST has effected for us, is no better argument than it would be to object to the doctrine of spiritual assistance for the same reason [1]."

It is, therefore, no slight objection to the Latitudinarian system, that it should, on rationalistic grounds, absolutely deny, and vehemently oppose, one of CHRIST'S positive Institutions; and intimately connected with this, is its low appreciation of another —the Sacraments which have been especially entrusted to the Priesthood to administer.

It is the orthodox and Catholic doctrine, that these are "generally necessary to salvation," necessary, *i. e.*, not merely to particular classes, but to men in general, to all men. Thus, being born in sin, we are by Baptism taken out of that state, made partakers of the *present* benefits of CHRIST'S Redemption, and put into the way of obtaining those which are reserved for the world to come. The guilt of our past sins is done away, our natural corruption is checked and weakened, the influence of the HOLY SPIRIT is imparted to enable us to overcome it entirely, and we are by Him incorporated into CHRIST. That such is the doctrine of the Church of England will be evident to every one who studies her Formularies, especially her Catechism and Baptismal Offices, with care and impartiality: and it is also abundantly confirmed by the plain testimony of Holy Scripture, *e. g.* the words of our LORD to Nicodemus—"Except a man be born of water and of the SPIRIT, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of GOD:" those of S. Peter to the Jewish converts on the day of Pentecost, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the

[1] Froude's *Remains*, part ii. vol. i. p. 71. It was the sin of Korah, that he denied the authority of the Jewish Priesthood, on the ground that "all the congregation were holy, every one of them, and the Lord was among them." This sin, we learn from Jude 11, may be repeated in Christian times. Is not this a serious and important consideration for those who hold, and still more for those who act upon, such opinions as those inculcated by Hales or Arnold?

Name of JESUS CHRIST for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the HOLY GHOST:" those, again, of Ananias to S. Paul, three days after his miraculous conversion, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the LORD:" and those of S. Paul himself, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into JESUS CHRIST were baptized into His Death? Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death: that like as CHRIST was raised up from the Dead by the Glory of the FATHER, even so we also should walk in newness of life." "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is CHRIST. For by One SPIRIT are we all baptized into one body." "We are members of His Body, (formed out) of His Flesh, and (out) of His Bones"[1]. And the new life we thus have in CHRIST, and our union with Him, are maintained, supported, and strengthened by the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper; while His Body and Blood, Which we therein receive, are applied also to the cleansing from sin, and the remission of guilt. This, too, is plainly expressed in the Formularies of our Church, and proved by various passages of the New Testament. Our LORD, on one occasion, in the course of His Ministry, said to His Disciples, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the SON of MAN, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath Eternal Life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For My Flesh is Meat indeed, and My Blood is Drink indeed. He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the Living FATHER hath sent Me, and I live by the FATHER: so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me" (S. John vi. 53—57).

We cannot feel surprised that these deep words, when they were uttered, were obscure and mysterious, and that those who heard them were at a loss to imagine to what they referred. But we can readily perceive that the difficulty would be in great measure cleared up, at least to the twelve Apostles, when, on the night before His crucifixion, they saw Him "take Bread, and bless it, and break it, and give it to them, and say, Take, eat; This Is My Body. And He took the Cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of It; for This Is My Blood of the New Testament, Which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (S. Matt. xxvi. 26—28). Surely

[1] S. John iii. 5. Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16. Rom. vi. 4. 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. Eph. v. 30.

they would conclude from these words, at any rate when the earthly work of Redemption was completed, and "all things," according to their LORD's promise, "had been brought to their remembrance, whatsoever He had said unto them," that the Bread and Wine which they had received were, in some mysterious and supernatural, but also in a very real, sense, His Body and His Blood, and as necessary to the preservation of their spiritual life as their daily food and drink to that of their natural life. It is evident, too, from the words of S. Paul, that they regarded them as equally sacred and efficacious when administered by themselves, according to His command, as when received from His own Hands. "The Cup of Blessing," he asks, "which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of CHRIST? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of CHRIST?" whilst he assures the Corinthians, to whom he was writing, that "he that eateth this Bread, and drinketh this Cup of the LORD unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, *not discerning the* LORD's *Body*, for which cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep," have been visited with death (1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 27, 28). Now surely all this—the separate phrases and the whole recital—is utterly inconsistent with the account of this holy Rite, given by those Latitudinarian writers whose words we have quoted above. For our part, we cannot conceive any thing more contradictory; nor, if the words of Holy Scripture may be thus explained away, would it appear at all unnatural to deduce the most heretical doctrines from the most orthodox expressions.

But the Sacrament of our LORD's Body and Blood has been always regarded by the Church, not merely as the chief means of spiritual nourishment and strength, but also as the highest Act of Worship. It was instituted by our LORD at His Celebration of the Last Passover, in order to take that place in the Covenant which He had come to establish, which the Passover had occupied in that which was now ready to vanish away. He accordingly, on blessing the Elements and distributing them to His Apostles, said, "This do in Remembrance of Me," or rather, as we see clearly both from the surrounding circumstances and the sense which the words He employed bear in the Septuagint, "Offer This as My Memorial[1]." Consistently with this view of the Holy Eucharist, which is embodied in all the Liturgies and maintained by all the orthodox writers of Antiquity, S. Paul observes: "As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup,

[1] Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.—S. Luke xxii. 19.

ye do show the LORD's Death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26)—show It, that is, and plead Its Merits before Almighty GOD. Accordingly this was ever considered as the chief service, and from the earliest ages the only Service to which Christians were bound to resort; and until the unhappy rise of Protestantism, no day was suffered to pass, and still less any Sunday or Festival, without the due Celebration of the Holy Eucharist. Of this we have abundant testimony, not only from Ecclesiastical History, but from the pages of the New Testament. "And they," we read, of the first Christians, "continuing *daily*, with one accord in the temple, and 'breaking Bread' from house to house [*marginal rendering* 'at home'] . . . praising GOD, and having favour with all the people." And it is emphatically added, "The LORD added to the Church *daily* such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 46—47). Whilst, "upon the *first day of the week*, the Disciples," of Troas, we are told—and this was evidently not an observance peculiar to them—"came together to 'break Bread'" (Acts xx. 7).

Of course the nature of the Christian Sacraments has been here only touched upon. Volumes have been written to illustrate and enforce the view of them here taken, containing a mass of argument and evidence which we are necessarily unable to adduce; but what has been brought forward will, it is hoped, serve to show that it is the doctrine received by the Church from the LORD and His Apostles, and consequently, the miserable deficiency, nay, the daring impiety, of any system by which it is denied or put in the background. When the SON of GOD has prescribed certain Rites for the re-creation of the human race, for making men partakers of Himself, purifying their nature, and so qualifying them to be with Him eternally, what else is it but the most extreme arrogance and presumption for men, because with their limited faculties they cannot understand *how* they should be instrumental to such purposes, to pronounce them mere symbols, utterly destitute of power to effect them? Besides, such notions must be full of danger, as causing those amongst whom they prevail to neglect those means which have been provided for their spiritual good: and to such prevalence and consequent neglect may we not attribute much of the positive irreligion to be observed in the multitude, and the low degree of holiness to which others attain, who cannot be content to be as the multitude? Even in the case of those who resort to these Rites, a great difference must be made in the benefit derived, by their own expectations of what they are about to obtain. "*According to your faith* be it unto you," said our LORD, when He touched the eyes of the two blind men, who had asked Him to restore their

sight: and from various passages of the New Testament it is only reasonable to infer that He is guided by the same rule in bestowing His spiritual blessings. Is it, therefore, to be supposed, that he who comes to the Holy Communion expecting to derive from it no other advantage than the arousing of such sensations as might be produced by an acted sermon, should be equally benefited with a fellow-worshipper who regards it as the mode of nearest approach to his LORD which he is permitted on earth to enjoy, the appointed means of "obtaining the remission of his sins, and all other benefits of his SAVIOUR'S Passion?"

"Without faith," we are told, "it is impossible to please GOD," and that faith must, of course, include as its object all which He has revealed that is brought to our knowledge. Surely, then, it is an obvious and fatal objection to any System of Religion, that it looks with suspicion on Articles of Faith, tries to reduce them to the lowest possible number, rejects what have been held by Christians from the beginning and what they who hold them appeal to Scripture to support; and thus induces and encourages a spirit of disbelief. Well has it been observed, in a work before referred to, (Rose's *State of Protestantism in Germany*, p. 88, second edition,) that "if man must err, if he will not be content with the Religion of CHRIST, as CHRIST taught it, far, far better for him is it to believe too much than too little. He may assent perhaps to error, but the principle of his belief is still pure and unsullied. He may receive some things, perhaps, which never came from his Heavenly FATHER, with the reverence which is due to the Word of GOD alone: but his reverence, his affection, his child-like love of that Word, still remain, and without them there is no knowledge, no real feeling, no sincere reception of the elevating and improving truths of Christianity."

JOSEPH OLDKNOW.

The Three Vows.

When in the beginning God spake the Word, and called His Creation out of nothingness, He created every individual creature that composed it in union with Himself. The Creator penetrated and permeated all things. He was in every work of His hands, as theologians say, by Essence, by Presence, and by Power; or, in the words of S. Paul, in Him every creature lived, and moved, and had its being.

Not only so, but in His Creation, as a whole, and in every part of it, the Creator beheld Himself. There was not a creature that did not in some way mirror and reflect God. The least as well as the greatest represented in time an idea that had existed from everlasting in the mind of God. God gazed on His spiritual Creation, the beautiful army of the Angels, and in every member of its nine wondrous orders He beheld Himself. God gazed on His material Creation, and in every atom that went to make up the universe He beheld Himself. God gazed also on that Creation of His which united in itself the spiritual and the material, and in each of the two persons who then composed it He beheld a shining image and likeness of Himself. And because God beheld Himself in every creature, His whole Creation was to Him a source of the most exquisite delight. Not only did it contain nothing which could offend His Eye, but there was in it nothing on which the Eye of God could rest without the most entire and intense complacency, approbation, and love. There was not even the tameness of monotony to satiate the gaze of God; for every creature differed from its fellow-creature, representing its Creator in a different aspect, and from, as it were, a different point of view. Angels and stars alike differed in their glory; and yet that glory was one as God is One, the Maker of Heaven and earth. God is bound to love Himself, seeing that in Him there is nothing that is not entirely lovable; and so, when reviewing His Creation, He loved it for the sake of what He therein saw reflected as in a glass, and then pronounced every individual creature of it to be very good.

And yet, albeit this relation of union between the Creator and His Creation, and that love which was its consequence, was so desirable as conducive to and effective of not only the Creator's greater Glory but the creature's greatest good, God

willed not that it should continue against the will, nay, without the consent, of the creature. GOD does not simply *use* His creatures whether to effect or to increase His own Glory: they must co-operate with Him, enter into His purposes, and voluntarily aid Him in carrying out His All-wise designs.

As for GOD, by what theologians call His antecedent Will, that is, so far as He Himself was concerned, He willed eternal union and concord between Himself and His creature. But if the creature willed divorce and discord, divorce and discord it would be. The creature did will divorce and discord; and so, divorce and discord it was.

At the instant that Sin entered into His Creation the CREATOR withdrew Himself, and the creature fell dead. Just as on the instant that there enters into the body aught antagonistic to and inconsistent with its longer habitation by the soul, the soul leaves the body, and the body falls dead. GOD and Sin can no more co-exist in the same creature than light and darkness can co-exist in the same chamber. "What fellowship hath Righteousness with unrighteousness—what concord hath CHRIST with Belial?"

GOD gazed upon His fallen creatures—angelic and human—after they had severally sinned. Both creations were in like evil case. Both were separated from, lay outside of, and were without GOD. Both, being graceless, had ceased to be objects of His Love; and both, being sinful, had become objects of His just, nay, necessary, Wrath.

But there was a difference.

From His spiritual creation GOD had withdrawn Himself at once and for ever. The sinning Angels were eternally dissevered from their CREATOR and His Love. Eternally apart from Him, and containing nought of Himself in them, there was nothing in them that GOD could love, and so they became the objects of His eternal Wrath. He gazed on that world of ruined grandeurs, and there was in it no object on which His Eye could rest save with displeasure.

But it was different with that other fallen creature, in whose person were wedded the spiritual and the material. True, the Supernatural Image and Likeness of GOD had vanished from the soul of man. His soul was no longer a vessel of GOD's grace—that grace whereby man is made a partaker of the Divine Nature. Grace which, as S. Augustine says, is "the Soul of the soul," had departed; the soul that had sinned was dead.

But besides His Supernatural Image, there was an Image of

God which was natural to man. This natural Image could not be parted with at his pleasure or be lost by sin, for it was intimately bound up with and indelibly imprinted on his very nature. It could not cease to be apparent while that nature continued to exist. And it was this Image that stirred the Heart of God within Him as He gazed. It was this likeness that made the Divine bowels to yearn over the fallen human creature. Amid all the wreck and ruin, the havoc and desolation which Sin had wrought, the Eye of God could still discern in the soul of man, defaced and defiled as it was, stripped and naked, wounded and half dead as the robber had left it, a likeness, distorted perhaps, and only glimmering in the darkness—but yet a likeness of another human soul, which as an idea had existed in the Mind of God from all eternity, reflecting in its three powers of memory, intellect, and will, the Three Persons from whose single and undivided Essence it derived its own.

The body of man, too, which his soul tenanted, was cast in a mould, and fashioned after the similitude of a pattern, that was familiar to the Mind of God. That pattern, His eternal Idea of the Perfect Man, He had before Him as a model when, on the first Friday, He formed a body of the dust of the ground, and, infusing into it a rational soul, He called it "Man." And even now, in its fallen state, in that naked shamefaced body with its crippled soul, He looked upon the Face of His Christ, and longed for re-union with His separated human creation for the sake of its model and cause—the potential Man, even Jesus.

God longed, we say, for re-union with fallen humanity. But what God longs for must be possible; inasmuch as God, being God, cannot long for the impossible. Means and a way, then, must be devised whereby the Creator may enter again into His own Creation, unite it with Himself, make it lovable, and love it.

In that which caused God's longing for this re-union He found the means of effecting it. The Mediator between God and Man was to be the Man—Christ Jesus. In Him "Mercy and Truth met together; Righteousness and Peace kissed each other." In Him were two distinct Natures united in one Person. Of these two Natures, one was Divine and one was human. The Divine Nature was that of the Only-begotten Son of God, the Second Person of the Undivided Trinity. It was Consubstantial with the nature of the First and Third Persons, and He was with them Co-eternal and Co-equal. The

human Nature was consubstantial with the nature common to mankind, and, being so, was, like it, created and temporal. It was human nature, and not the body of any human person, that the LORD assumed and united to His Divinity. It was humanity in the abstract, and not in the concrete. This humanity and this Divinity were united in one Person; and that one Person was not human, but Divine. It was the Divine and Uncreated Person of the Eternal WORD. JESUS CHRIST, Perfect GOD of the substance of the Eternal FATHER, and also Perfect MAN of the substance of His Virgin Mother Mary, is yet not two, but One CHRIST. And this not by confusion of the Substances, the human and the Divine, the created and the uncreated, the finite and the infinite, the temporal and the eternal; but in virtue of the unity of that One Divine Person in which they were at once and for ever united. As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, united together in one human person, so GOD and Man, united together in one Divine Person, is One CHRIST.

In either case it is the *person* that individuates, and determines the character of that which is united to it. In the latter case, what follows? Divinity was not converted into flesh, but humanity was taken into GOD. Humanity was Divinized—was Deified. Humanity became adorable; adorable too not with an inferior and relative worship, but, in virtue of its personal union with Divinity, adorable with and entitled to the supreme worship which is due to the uncreated Essence of the Eternal TRINITY.

This was indeed entering into His Creation—entering as He had never entered before. This was a union with the creature, such as the creature could not have conceived possible in its wildest dreams. In virtue of this union the creature became, not lovable only, but absolutely adorable. CHRIST cannot, by reason of His Divine Person, be spoken of as a Creature; but that Humanity which He assumed was created: and of that Humanity GOD spake and said, "Let all the Angels of GOD worship" It. Before It Gabriel abased himself in the first instant of Its conception. In Its honour the Host of Heaven sang the first *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* as It slumbered on the straw in the manger. And when It exchanged that hard for a harder bed—the manger cradle for the cruel Cross—and slumbered in a deeper sleep, the several parts into which the dissolution which men call death had separated the Humanity, were singly and severally adorable with supremest worship, due to each by reason of its union with and in the Personal Divinity. The Dead Body of GOD, as it hung on the Cross, was adored by holy men yet in the

flesh; the departed Soul of GOD was adored by the disembodied souls of the just as It entered the place where they awaited Its advent; while holy Angels adored the Blood of GOD wherewith the earth was drenched and whereby it was delivered from the curse, as they kept their watch over It in the place where It lay till It should be re-assumed in the Resurrection of the first Easter Day.

And when the Resurrection was accomplished, and the Forty Days were ended, the CREATOR exalted the creature into which He had entered, and to which He had for ever allied Himself, to a place which was the natural result, the legitimate, nay, the necessary consequence of that entrance and that union. That which, apart from its deification by the intimacy of Its personal union with Divinity, would have been but dust and ashes—that which, deified as It is, is yet flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, sprung from the loins of Adam, drawn from the Blood of Mary, GOD raised on high and seated on the co-eternal and co-equal Throne, side by side with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST.

GOD was satisfied.

Greater exaltation was not possible to the creature: closer union was not possible to the CREATOR. But was GOD satiated? Was there nothing left to long for?

That portion of GOD's material creation which adhered to, found its centre in, and was individuated by the Divine Person of His SON, and composed the Body "prepared" for Him, was, together with that human Soul which tenanted it, a source of exquisite and endless gratification to the Eternal FATHER.

But how about the rest of His human creation which was yet apart from Him? It was yet unloved by Him, save with a reflected love, as being that from which the Deified and Adorable Humanity had been taken. Was it to remain apart from and unloved by GOD for ever? Was it to content itself here on earth with the barren honour of its natural relationship to the Man who was, and was to be for endless ages, the object of the worship of the hosts of Heaven? Or might there yet be union between itself and its Maker? Might it yet be lovable and loved? Might it yet be made *worthy* of the Love of GOD?

The answer to this, as to all questions else, whether of Nature or of Grace, is to be found in that to which all Nature is subordinated, and from which all Grace flows—the Incarnation of the Word.

It is the Deified and Adorable Humanity that solves every

enigma, that relieves every difficulty, and that supplies the answer to every question: and it answers this.

If our sin-infected and sin-infecting, defiled and defiling, humanity could by any means come in contact with and be united to the healed and healing, cleansed and cleansing, renewed and renewing, Deified and Deifying, Humanity of JESUS CHRIST, it would in effect be united to Divinity as well, in virtue of the perfect union of Both in His one Divine Person. That it can be, we know. JESUS is the Mediator between GOD and man: and union with JESUS the Mediator is in reality and in fact union with GOD the CREATOR. But how? What are the means whereby this union is to be effected?

To discover this, we must have a clear idea of the separated terms; and this will probably result in a clear idea of the means of their union. In other words, the answers to two questions—What is JESUS? and—What is Man? will give us some insight into the necessary nature of that which is required to unite them.

In JESUS—GOD and Man—are united two things, Divinity and Humanity. In Him is something which may be, has been, is, and will be, seen and heard and handled; and something which is invisible, inaudible, and intangible by mortal eyes and ears and hands. In familiar words, there is in JESUS something which is outward and visible, and something also which is inward and spiritual.

In man are united two things—a body and a soul. In him is something which may be seen and heard and handled, and something also which is invisible, inaudible, and intangible by mortal eyes and ears and hands—something which is outward and visible, something, also, which is inward and spiritual.

What follows?

It follows that if the two, JESUS in Heaven and man on earth, are to be united, it must be by means of something which is at once outward and visible, and inward and spiritual.

In other words, it must be by means of Sacraments.

Unbelief or defective belief in the Sacraments, is invariably the result of unbelief or defective belief in the two Natures and one Person of CHRIST, or ignorance as to the two creations, the material and the spiritual, the body and the soul, which together make man. A full, accurate, and clear appreciation of what JESUS is, and what Man is, must result in a vivid grasp of the theory of the Sacraments which unite them.

Again; the outward and the inward, the visible and the spiritual parts of every Sacrament are severally comprehended by the

outward or bodily, and by the inward or spiritual powers or faculties wherewith man has been endowed. With the eyes of his body man gazes on the outward sign; with the eyes of his soul he pierces the material veil and gazes on the inward spiritual grace. He sees the one by sight: the other he sees by faith.

We now know somewhat of the *nature* of the Sacraments: about their *operation* we have yet to learn.

What says S. Paul? "The invisible things of God," he teaches the Romans and us, "are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." We are to study the outward, and so attain to a knowledge of the inward. The processes of Nature will reveal to us the processes of Grace. They are analogous—they lie parallel—and the one reflects the other.

Among other processes of animal nature, four are distinct and well defined:—

1. There is birth, which is life-giving.
2. There is increase, which is strengthening.
3. There is food, which is refreshing.
4. There is decay, which tends to and causes separation and death.

In like manner, in the Kingdom of Grace four Sacramental processes are distinct and well defined:—

1. There is the new birth of the soul, or the infusion into a dead soul of that grace which is its life.
2. There is the increase, or strengthening of that living soul, resulting in a robuster spiritual life, the effect of other more manifold and greater graces.
3. There is the refreshing of the soul by continual supplies of spiritual food.
4. And lastly, there is medicine or healing, which prevents, or arrests, or repairs decay, which hinders separation and death, or re-unites the separated soul to God, and raises the dead or restores the sin-sick soul to spiritual life and its former health.

In short, Baptism, Confirmation, Communion, and Penance, are the means whereby Union with Jesus is begun and strengthened, is sustained and restored.

I. Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Had Adam never fallen, he would in due time have attained to his reward, Heaven, as a habitation for himself, and as an inheritance for his children. In that case, when we went hence, we should have had but to prove our pedigree, to enter on our in-

heritance. As it is, our kinship with the first Adam only causes us to be conceived and born in sin, and the children of wrath. We must be born again. We must become the children of another. We must call no man on the earth our father. We must acquire a right to call one our FATHER Who is in Heaven. We must stand to the Second Adam in a supernatural relation, equivalent to that natural relation in which we stand to the first. We must be made members of CHRIST if we are to be children of GOD, and so inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. It belongs to us as the children of that JESUS Who merited it for Himself and His. Into it He has entered, of it He has taken possession, as the Head and as the Firstfruits of the New Race. To it, in common with our brethren of the one Christian family, we acquired a title when, made Christians, "christened" by our Baptism, we became fellow-heirs with them, being fellow-members of the one Body. Then having assigned to us a place in the household of Faith, and having our names enrolled among the Children of JESUS, we obtained a part and a lot in the inheritance of the Saints.

Could we see with our outward eyes what we can see with the eyes of our souls, we should see the HOLY GHOST of GOD brooding on the hallowed waters of the Baptismal Font, as of old He moved on the face of the waters in the first creation, and descending on the new-born child of JESUS, as He did on that day when, by means of the Adorable Humanity, by the touch of His most sacred Flesh, JESUS for ever sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin. And could we hear with our outward ears what we can hear with the ears of our souls, we would hear the voice of the Eternal FATHER saying of each one of His human children as of the Only-begotten, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

II. But the Child of JESUS will not be suffered to continue in the Family of JESUS without a struggle. It is a child of the first Adam by nature; it is a Child of the Second ADAM by Grace. It will have to contend for its heritage with him who tempted both. It has enemies without and enemies within; enemies visible and enemies invisible, evil men and evil angels, the world and the devil, and a foe, besides, of its own household, the rebellious flesh. It has to fight not only against flesh and blood, but against what were once principalities and powers, against spiritual wickedness in high places. It must have strength, and its Father knows what it needs; and what it needs its Father can supply. And He does supply it, just at that

time when the child needs it most—when it is going forth to fight. At that very time when the world begins to entice with its attractive allurements, and the devil to beguile with his seducing wiles, and the flesh to assert itself, He sends to it the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, to strengthen it with His sevenfold Gifts. Made, in its Baptism, a Child of God, it becomes, in its Confirmation, a Soldier of Christ. His enemies are its enemies, and, strengthened with His strength, it goes forth to fight and conquer. The Grace of Confirmation enables it to despise the world, to resist the Devil, to subdue the flesh, and so to hold its own and keep its place in the Family of Jesus.

What the soul is to the body, that is God's grace to the soul. When the soul enters the body, the body lives; when the soul departs from the body, the body dies. When God enters the soul, the soul lives; when God departs from the soul, the soul dies. The indwelling Spirit is the principle of Life to the Christian soul.

But it is more. It is a cause of the unity of the Mystical Body. The unity of the natural body is caused by the unity of its members one with another, and by the unity of that soul which permeates and animates them all. The presence of the soul in and throughout the members of the body is like the presence of God in and throughout entire creation, who is *Totus in toto, Totus quoque in ejus quâlibet parte.* In like manner the baptized, made in their Baptism members of the one Body of the One Christ, become also permeated and animated as with a common soul, by the One Holy Ghost, of whom, in Holy Confirmation, their bodies become the temples, and their souls the shrines.

III. Like the living, full-grown body, however, the living, full-grown soul is liable to the ravages of decay. To supply the losses of decay, it must have the aliment of bread and wine. Food is as necessary to sustain and refresh the soul as it is necessary to sustain and refresh the body. The supply of spiritual food to the soul is the third Sacramental process.

The Word Made Flesh spoke eight words the night before He died, and these eight words have extended and perpetuated the Incarnation upon the earth, so that Jesus is still Emmanuel —God with us. These eight words were, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood." They were at once creative, declaratory, and sacrificial. 1. They were creative. God, Who created the earth, created also the seed that is sown therein. On that seed He caused His rain to fall, and His sun to shine. By His

continual Providence it took root downward and bore fruit upward. From the ripened corn was made that bread which is the staff of life; and from the ripened grape was expressed that wine which maketh glad the heart of man. This bread, in GOD'S Hands and at His Word, was, on one day, multiplied to feed men's fainting bodies, and on another was, in His Hands, and at His Word, consecrated to the satisfying of men's fainting souls. On the same night that He was betrayed, JESUS, taking of the unleavened bread that remained from the last Passover supper, turned it into His most sacred Body; and taking from the table a chalice of wine mingled with water, after the custom of the feast, He Whose first miracle was to turn water into wine, turned wine into His most precious Blood. At their Creator's will, and by His words, His creatures of bread and wine became what their Creator declared them to be. 2. For when He said "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood," the words were not only creative, but declaratory. They were not only the miraculous cause, but they revealed what the miracle had effected. Volume on volume has been, and many a volume more may be, written about the Blessed Sacrament, but the whole doctrine, the entire revealed truth concerning it, is comprehended, contained, and summed up in these eight words. *This,* which appears to carnal eyes to be bread, is, to the eyes of the soul, and in reality, His Body. This *is* My Body in the self-same moment in which the words are spoken which at once work and proclaim the miracle. This is *My* Body, for I have none other, which was conceived by the HOLY GHOST, which was born of the Virgin Mary, which suffered under Pontius Pilate, which was crucified, which died, and was buried in Joseph's grave, which ascended into Heaven, and is there seated on the Great White Throne, side by side with the Father and the HOLY GHOST. This is My *Body,* and This is My *Blood.* A body apart from that blood, which is its life, is dead. The Body of CHRIST lies on the Altar apart from the Blood of CHRIST, and thus the eight words show forth the Death of CHRIST, and are, 3, not only creative and declaratory, but sacrificial. For to whom are these words addressed? Before whom do they represent and commemorate the LORD'S death? It is before the Eternal FATHER, to Whom they are spoken by His Incarnate SON. They are creative as spoken by JESUS the Creator, and therefore the King. They are declaratory, as spoken by JESUS the Prophet, the Revealer and Teacher of GOD'S Truth. They are sacrificial, as spoken by JESUS the Priest, the Mediator between GOD and Man. There are the two separated parties—the offended GOD there in Heaven, His human

creatures with whom He is offended here on earth. JESUS the Mediator steps between them. Attracting away from them the gaze of the Eternal FATHER, and concentrating it full upon Himself, He addresses Him and says, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood." Behold the Body given and the Blood shed for these men, and for their salvation. Regard not their sins, but look upon the Face of Thy CHRIST.

This He did in so many words on the Thursday; and this, by the mouth of His Priests, He does in so many words still. This He did in effect when, on the Friday, His Body hung on the Cross, and the separated Blood lay poured out upon the ground. This He does now, and will do ever, even until the end, before the Great White Throne. Under the species of a LAMB standing, yet "as it had been slain," our Great High Priest constantly offers Himself, the Mystic LAMB slain before the foundation of the world, the LAMB of GOD that takes away the sins of a world that lieth in wickedness. A dead body cannot stand, and so the LAMB standing represents the Living JESUS: yet as He had been slain, for the Five Wounds recall to GOD the Sacrifice of the Cross. Nor are these three Sacrifices—the Sacrifice of the Cross, the Sacrifice of the Heavenly Altar, and the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, really three, separate and distinct. They are but three acts of one mighty Function, three aspects of the One full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction once offered for the sins of the whole world. The mode of the Oblation differs in each; but the Priest who offers and the Victim offered is in all one and the same.

There is One GOD, and one Mediator between GOD and man, the *Man* CHRIST JESUS. He in Whose Person the two Natures meet, the GOD-Man, mediates or intervenes. He stands in the middle between the two, to be the Medium of their communications and the Means of their union. As such He has an office to each. To each He has somewhat to say, and to each He has somewhat to do. What He says and what He offers to GOD, that He says and that He gives to man. To GOD He offers Himself, and says, "This is My Body," and "This is My Blood." To man he gives Himself, and says, "The Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." And again, "The Blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST which was shed for thee." To GOD He offers Himself as a Sacrifice: to man He gives Himself as a Sacrament. And this, "that they may be one." Those who duly receive those Holy Mysteries are made partakers of His most Blessed Body and Blood. Every Communion of the Deified

Humanity intensifies their union with GOD, makes them more and more partakers of the Divine Nature, and serves to assure them of their being very members incorporate in His Mystical Body, that He dwells in them, that He is one with them, and that they are one with Him.

IV. And yet all this may be undone; and whether it will endure or be undone depends not on the CREATOR alone, but on the creature. The union of the two, the CREATOR and the creature, begun in Holy Baptism, strengthened in Holy Confirmation, and intensified in Holy Communion, may, if the creature so will, come to nought. Instead of union there may be separation; instead of marriage there may be divorce.

Marriage is the union of one with one. Spiritual marriage is the union of the individual soul with the One GOD. JESUS is the Bridegroom, the soul is the bride. So long as the soul is faithful, JESUS dwells with it: whenever it defiles itself with earthly loves, JESUS departs. "Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me," is the Marriage covenant. A following after strange gods is spiritual adultery. Setting the creature in the place of the CREATOR, cultivating attachments antagonistic to or inconsistent with its lawful love, deprives the soul of the Love of GOD. Deprived of GOD's Love, the soul falls dead: and the death of the soul dissolves their wedlock. In a word, what sunders the union of the soul with JESUS is sin.

There are two kinds of sin. They differ in their nature and in their effects. One amounts simply to an inordinate conversion of the soul to the creature: the other includes an aversion of the soul from its CREATOR. The one weakens their union; the other destroys it. The one wounds, the other slays. The one is called venial, because, in respect of the other, it is easily pardonable. The other kills the soul by severing it from GOD, Who is its life; and so it is called deadly or mortal.

Man consists of body and soul; and with both body and soul man sins. He sins with every faculty of his soul, with his memory, with his intellect, and with his will. With his memory he receives and houses the bad thought; with his intellect he contemplates and indulges it; with his will he consents to and embraces it. And then with his body he gives effect and outward reality to what his soul has willed; with his lips he utters the wicked word; with his members he does the evil deed.

How is a soul separated from GOD to be re-united to GOD? How is a dead soul to be made alive? The same causes which made a Sacramental process necessary as the means of its regene-

ration, make a Sacramental process necessary as the means of its resuscitation. It will be necessary so long as JESUS and man are what they severally are, containing within themselves something which is outward and visible, and something besides which is inward and spiritual. There is a fourth Sacramental process, and it is distinguished by the name of 'Penance.'

The soul in Penance makes an exact retracing of its steps. It attains re-union with its GOD by a process the precise converse of the process of its separation from Him. The departing soul set its back to GOD and set its face to sin: the returning soul sets its back to sin and its face toward GOD. The process of Penance, moreover, requires the co-operation of both soul and body, inasmuch as both soul and body co-operated in that sin which made Penance necessary. The soul repents, and with its every faculty. The memory recalls the sin. The intellect appreciates it, and the distance it has interposed between the soul and GOD. While the will rejects it and embraces GOD, turning to Him as its first Beginning, and last End. And then to the internal resolution of the soul the body gives external expression. With its lips it makes confession, and in its members it endures the punishment by way of satisfaction. In other words, the co-operation of soul and body is necessary in order to the three parts of Penance—Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction.

And now man has done his part, what is GOD'S part?

No sooner does the creature consent than the CREATOR re-enters it, re-unites it to Himself, and makes it once more loveable. Baptismal grace revives, Pentecostal gifts return, and good works, once dead by reason of sin, are quickened again by the presence of that charity which repentance has restored. GOD gazes once more on His creature with looks of complacency, and pleasure, and love, for in that creature He sees once more reflected His own Image and Likeness, and recognizes the Face of His CHRIST.

Among the human creatures which the CREATOR has (by means of the adorable Humanity communicated and conveyed through the Sacraments) reunited to Himself, there are gradations of rank and differences of degree. All are united to CHRIST, and in CHRIST to GOD, but with some the union is more, with some less intimate and close. All are members of the One Body, but some are nearer than others to the One Head, "from which all the Body, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of GOD." It is the same SPIRIT that animates all the members, but there are diversities of gifts. The same LORD is over all, and in all, yet there are differ-

ences of administration. It is the same GOD that worketh all in all, but there are diversities of operations. "The manifestation of the SPIRIT is given to every man to profit withal." But His gifts are diverse. He divides to every man severally as He wills. As the natural body of man is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also is CHRIST. His Body mystical is not one member, but many; and GOD hath set the members every one of them in that Body, as it hath pleased Him. Some are nearer the Head, and some are more remote from It than others. And the nearer they are to the Head, which is in Heaven, the further they are from the earth, and the things of earth. *Perfect* union with the CREATOR requires *perfect* separation from the creature; *complete* attachment to the one implies *complete* detachment from the other; *entire* conversion to GOD necessitates *entire* aversion from all which is —not GOD.

Religion is that whereby one exhibits somewhat to the service and worship of GOD. When that somewhat is one's all, their estate who so worship is called *par excellence* the Estate of Religion.

To exhibit somewhat to the service of GOD is of necessity to salvation; wholly to devote oneself and one's substance to it, belongs to perfection. And they are technically called *Religious* who are in the Estate of Perfection. Not that every one who is in the estate of Religion is already perfect. All who enter Religion do indeed thereby profess their desire of perfection, and all who remain in it profess thereby that they are tending towards it. But of these some are starting on their journey, some have made progress on their way, while some have arrived at their end.

All persons are religious persons who are in Sacramental Union with the Man CHRIST JESUS; but those persons are *autonomastically* called Religious who devote themselves wholly to the Divine Service, offering themselves, as it were, an holocaust to GOD. Of such S. Gregory says: "There be some who reserve nothing for themselves, but immolate to the Almighty GOD the senses, the speech, the life, and the substance which they have received from Him."

Etymologically, according to S. Augustine, Religion is either a re-binding of man to GOD (*religare*), or a re-electing of GOD by man as his end (*re-eligere*). Considered either way, when the re-binding is such that it ignores all other ties, when the re-election knows no other object of choice, it is called emphatically *Religion*.

A man who offers himself a holocaust to God offers all that he is and all that he has; all that he is—his soul and his body; all that he has—his substance and his surroundings. Here then are three things—his body, his soul, and his substance—and the acts of oblation whereby these three are severally renounced and given to God are the Three Vows of Chastity, of Obedience, and of Poverty.

I. *The Vow of Poverty.* "There be some," says S. Gregory, in his *Morals* (viii. 15), "who, girding themselves to reach the height of perfection, while inwardly they covet the highest things, outwardly abandon all things. The possession of riches distracts and draws away the soul from God and the things of God. 'The care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the Word,' and the rich man becometh unfruitful."

It is difficult to preserve charity along with riches, much less to attain to its perfection. Jesus said to His Disciples, "Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." As S. Chrysostom, expounding that text (S. Matt. xix. 23) says, "It is hard for those who possess riches; for those who put their trust in them, it is impossible." And the Son of Sirach, contemplating with wonder, as a rarity and a marvel, a rich man who is also just, says, "Blessed is the rich that is found without blemish, and hath not gone after gold! Who is he? And we will call him Blessed, for he hath done wonderful things—that he should possess riches and not cleave unto them."

In order to attain perfection it is necessary that one wholly abstract his affections from all earthly things, for as S. Augustine says in his *Confessions* (x. 29), speaking to God, "He loves Thee less who, along with Thee loves somewhat which he loves not because of Thee. It is more difficult to give up what one has than to abstain from coveting what one has not; for, in the one case, the tie to earth is not yet, in the other it is already formed. And in order that the soul may freely soar heavenwards it must be sundered. The young man in the Gospel went away grieved and very sorrowful, for he had great possessions. Jesus had said to him, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. But if thou wilt be *perfect, sell all,* and distribute to the poor, and come and follow Me.'"

Nor need those who give up all earthly goods, if in order to follow Christ, be solicitous about the future. Not only in the life to come will they have treasure in Heaven, but, as S. Augustine, commenting on the Sermon on the Mount, reminds them,

they may trust their future in the life that now is to His Providence, Who hath said that if they seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, all things necessary shall be added unto them.

Renunciation of riches stands to almsgiving as does the universal to the particular, and as does a holocaust to a sacrifice. S. Gregory, commenting on Ezekiel, says, "Those who minister of their possessions offer sacrifice, they immolate somewhat to God, and somewhat they reserve for themselves; those who reserve nought for themselves offer a holocaust, which is greater than a sacrifice."

The necessity of separating oneself from the earth in order to follow after higher things was apparent to even the heathen mind. S. Jerome, in his *Epistle to Paulinus*, relates how Crates the Theban, once one of the richest of men, when he went to Athens to study philosophy, lightened himself of a great weight of gold, for he thought he could not possess at the same time both riches and virtues. Aristotle, too, in the *Tenth Book of the Ethics*, teaches that for operation external goods are a necessity, but that to speculation they are impediments. In another Epistle, that to the monk Rusticus, S. Jerome gives the terse counsel, *Christum nudum nudus sequere*—"Follow naked a naked Christ."

2. *The Vow of Chastity*, or Voluntary and Perpetual Continence. Perpetual Continence is requisite in order to the perfection of Religion, that is, to the perfect union of the soul with God, as well as voluntary Poverty, and for the same reason, namely, that every thing must be cut off whereby a man may in any wise be hindered from wholly cleaving unto God. This marriage intercourse does, and that in two ways: in one way, by reason of the gratification of the senses, consequent on entering the estate of Holy Matrimony, which tends to enervate, to engross, and to depress the soul: in another way, by reason of the solicitude which must necessarily occupy a man who has to govern others, a wife and children, and to care for those temporal matters which are necessary in order to their sustenance. As to the first, S. Augustine says in his *Soliloquies* (ii. 10), "Nihil esse sentio, quod magis ex arce dejiciat animum virilem, quam blandimenta feminea, corporumque ille contactus, sine quo uxor haberi non potest." As to the second, S. Paul writes to the Corinthians:—"He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how

he may please his wife" (1 Cor. vii. 32, 33). Continence then is of necessity to Religion, as the perfection of charity, the bond of union between the soul and God, as much as is poverty; and as Vigilantius was in error who equalled riches to poverty, so also was Jovinian who equalled matrimony to virginity.

3. *The Vow of Obedience.* Religious perfection chiefly consists in perfect imitation or following of Christ. "If thou wilt be perfect . . . follow Me." But what was more commendable or commended in Christ than His implicit and perfect obedience? "He became obedient unto death." It was His meat and drink to do the Will of His Heavenly Father; and for thirty, out of the thirty-three years, He condescended to learn, to acquire by experience, that Obedience which, as an infused virtue, He already possessed, and that by subjecting His human Will to the will of His earthly Mother. Obedience was the solid and lasting foundation on which He reared the Christian Religion, and other foundation can no man lay, especially those who strive after perfection. S. Paul exhorts all men, secular as well as religious, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves" (Heb. xiii. 17). The obedience of Seculars concerns those things which belong to the necessity of virtue; the obedience of Religious concerns those things which belong to the exercise of perfection. The one is related to the other as is the universal to the particular.

The estate of Religion may be considered in three aspects:—

I. As it is an exercise tending to the perfection of charity, including the acquisition of all virtues of which charity is the teeming mother.

II. As preserving man's soul in quiet from actual cares.

III. As a holocaust, whereby one wholly offers one's self and one's own to God.

I. To the exercise of perfection it is required that one wholly remove from one's self those things whereby one may possibly be hindered from entirely concentrating one's affections upon God, in which consists the perfection of charity. And of such impediments there are three:—1. Covetousness of external goods, which is taken away by the Vow of Poverty. 2. Concupiscence, which is excluded by the Vow of Continence. 3. Inordination of the will, which is prevented by the Vow of Obedience.

II. Inquietude of soul from secular solicitude or worldly care has three principal causes:—1. The dispensation of goods, taken

away by the Vow of Poverty. 2. The government of wife and children, excluded by the Vow of Continence. 3. The disposal of one's own actions, prevented by the Vow of Obedience, whereby one commits one's self to the disposal and guidance of another.

III. Similarly also the holocaust of Religion is threefold, consisting—1. Of man's substance; 2. Of his body, and its sensual gratification; 3. Of his soul, or rather of his will, whereby he uses all the powers and habits of his soul. And these three are offered respectively by the Three Vows of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience.

These Three Vows then are the three Acts of Religion, and under them all other religious observances may be comprehended and arranged; as, for instance, 1. Labour and mendicity under the head of Poverty; 2. Vigils, fasts, and other bodily macerations under that of Continence, to which they lead; 3. Study, prayer, preaching, visitation of the sick or the like, under Obedience, of which they form the subject-matter.

Of the Three Vows, that of Obedience is the most valuable and well-pleasing to GOD—1. As offering to Him the will, which is a greater oblation than man's body or his goods. 2. As containing and comprehending under it both the others. 3. As in itself nearest to the end of Religion. It is, moreover, so essential to Religion that the other two Vows apart from it would not place a man in the estate of a Religious.

Further, the permanence of these acts of renunciation and oblation of the creature must be secured by Vow, for he will not be made perfect who follows CHRIST for a season, but he who follows Him even unto the end. "No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of GOD." Religious perfection, too, requires the renunciation and oblation of *all;* and there is no act whereby a man may offer his whole life to GOD, save a Vow.

A Vow is essential in the case of Poverty, which does not exist so long as one retains any control, actual or potential, over one's property. It is necessary in the case of Continence, in regard of the reasons assigned, as removing the proximate causes of the first, and preventing the possibility of the second. It is necessary also in the case of Obedience, which is not perfect so long as the subjection of the will which it implies is temporary and liable to be withdrawn.

Regarding Religion as the wedding together of GOD and man —the marriage of the soul with JESUS, Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience are essential and component parts of the Marriage

Covenant and Vow. By the Vow of Poverty, the property of the bride merges in the *communio bonorum*, to become the children's heritage; the Vow of Chastity is a necessity of marriage, which is the union of one with one, and includes the renunciation of one's power over one's own body; while Obedience is the sworn duty of an earthly spouse, much more of a bride of CHRIST.

The permanence of the tie is, to our mind, inevitable, albeit its advisability is in these days called in question. We have not yet brought ourselves to embrace the idea of the French novelist, that so long as the spouses love, the marriage vow is superfluous, and that when they cease to love, the bond becomes a bondage.

Assuredly man may not offer to GOD what man would, if offered to himself, regard as an insult.

Even on the lower ground of expediency, the Religious Life, apart from the permanent obligation of a Vow, would be, to say the least, a cardinal mistake. Who can exaggerate the misery that would result from temporary unions, terminable at the pleasure of those who enter them, in place of the lifelong, indissoluble bond of Holy Matrimony? Still less can we conceive the wretchedness to which, and for similar obvious reasons, temporary Religious obligations would give rise, and of which the impossibility of release in either case prevents the occurrence.

We have considered the Three Vows which constitute what is technically called Religion from one point of view alone; that is, in their Theological aspect. There are many other questions with regard to them, but their solution does not fall within the scope of the present Essay. There is one, however, without which it would not be complete.

All men are bound to obey the commandments, to save their souls; but who are to follow the 'Counsels of Perfection?'

The CREATOR wills every individual creature to occupy a special place, and its own place, in His creation. His expression to the rational creature of this will is what is called—Vocation. But the CREATOR permits the rational creature to oppose its will to His; by an exercise of its freewill contrary to His, to defeat His original purpose concerning it: and to choose out and occupy a place in His creation other than that which He had originally destined for it. This is what is called—resisting Divine Vocation.

In order that the rational creature might both most easily and most perfectly fulfil the final cause of its place in creation, that is, its CREATOR'S greater Glory, and its own greatest good, the CREATOR has assigned to it the special graces appropriate to and effective of that end.

It follows that, while if and so long as the creature occupies its divinely destined place in creation, it enjoys the graces assigned thereto; if it refuses or deserts that place, it rejects or forfeits those graces.

But the correspondence and co-operation with, the use of special graces on earth and in time, merits the enjoyment of a special glory corresponding and correlative thereto in Eternity. He, therefore, who fails to occupy the place to which he is destined and called on earth, will fail to attain to the corresponding place originally destined for him in Heaven.

What we must do then is, first to find out what GOD wills and destines for us, and then by an act of our freewill to consent to and embrace our Divine destiny.

To make a good choice on any matter whatever, we must first meditate with a pure and upright intention on the end of our creation, which is GOD's Glory and our own salvation. Our choice, therefore, ought never to fall on any thing that does not lead us to this end; for it is evident that the means ought always to be subordinate to the end, and not the end to the means. Those persons deceive themselves who begin by determining on such and such a state—for example, on marriage—and afterwards form the resolution to serve GOD as well as they can in that state. That is to reverse the order, to take the means for the end, and the end for the means; it is to bend to GOD obliquely, so to say, and expect to draw the Will of GOD to ours, instead of making ours bow to that of GOD. We must do exactly the contrary; first, we must propose for our end what is the true end of man—the service of GOD; then, with a view to this end, choose such or such a state, as Marriage, or Holy Orders, or Religion, and determine our choice by the sole motive of arriving more certainly at our end. In a word, we ought not to decide upon one state in preference to another, but according as one or the other may conduce to the Glory of GOD and the salvation of our souls.

Of the estates of life, some are changeable, others irrevocable. When the choice has already taken place on an unchangeable matter, there is no longer any election to make. But if imprudence or some unruly affection has dictated a choice that it is not permitted to retract, as Matrimony, or the Priesthood, of one of which the bond is indissoluble, and of the other the *character* indelible, there is only one course to pursue—it is to repair the fault committed, by the regularity of our life and our fidelity to all our duties. There is no question here of change, for that is no longer allowed. Election must have its effect in its full

extent, although, made imprudently or from suspicious motives, it can never pass for a Divine Vocation; for there is no Divine Vocation unless dictated by pure motives and solid reason, unmixed with carnal affections or irregular inclinations.

With regard to the states that may be changed, as, for instance, in the case of secular professions or trades; if the choice was made with discretion and wisdom, it must not be changed; but we must endeavour to perfect ourselves more and more in the estate we have chosen. If, on the contrary, the election does not appear to have been sufficiently wise and Christian, we must change it, whatever it may cost, in order to render ourselves more agreeable to Almighty God, and make more sure the salvation of our own immortal souls.

Into the *details* of Vocation it is not the purpose of this Essay to enter. They are as various as are the individuals concerned. Birth, original position in life, worldly circumstances, wishes of parents and other superiors, talents, mental bent, moral dispositions, and the like, are among natural indications of what God wills concerning us. As to supernatural guidance, the Divine power sometimes gives to the will such an impulse that the soul does not and cannot doubt that it ought to follow it. In any case, the grand, general rule is to seek first to know God's Will, and then to do it.

Some men He wills to be the stewards of His Riches, and others to resemble Him in His Poverty; some He joins in Holy Matrimony, to others it is given to abide in yet holier Chastity; some men he sets over their fellow men as fathers or masters, others He subjects as servants and sons. To the one class it is promised that they shall enter into Life; to the other, that they shall follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.

William Humphrey.

On the Symbolism of Ritual.

Is the Religion taught by the system of the Church of England, honestly and consistently exhibited, a Sacramental, or a Non-sacramental Religion? This is the real question at issue between contending parties in the English Church at the present time. Attempts may be made, and are persistently made, to shirk the broader field of battle, and to narrow the struggle into a petty skirmishing about degrees and limits, moderation and excess, reasonable and unreasonable development in matters of Ritual, and still more pertinaciously to shift the ground altogether, and divide upon questions of public opinion, and national taste, and the like. But in the end, there is no escape from a return to the open field, and issue must be joined upon this great question, Sacramental, or Non-sacramental? The fight waxes hottest, at the present juncture, where the standard of Objective and Ceremonial Worship has been unfurled, and the extending ranks of those who have restored to the Christian army somewhat of its ancient glory and bravery, of outward magnificence and show, have become conspicuous, and challenged notice, even by their bright array. Ritualism, so called, has become for the moment the centre of the main interest of the fight, and all eyes are turned toward that quarter where its banners and symbols, and gold and colour, and the strains of its solemn, stately music, are seen and heard. But the struggle will, sooner or later—and signs are not wanting that the time is at hand—involve the whole army in a contest for its very life and constitution, its distinctive character as a portion of the vast army gathered under the true banner of the Cross.

The subject of the present Essay, the Symbolism of Ritual, is intimately involved in the Sacramental question. A Religion with a Sacramental system is of necessity a symbolical Religion, for Sacraments themselves are, as the Church of England is careful especially to maintain (Article XXV.), not mere badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but 'effectual signs' also of grace; and while 'effectual,' evident and expressive signs also, symbolical of the purposes for which they were severally ordained.

Symbolism is inseparable from a Sacramental Religion. So, likewise, of necessity, is Ritual, the system of Rites, by which a Sacramental Religion is exhibited and maintained; and Symbolism is therefore of necessity a characteristic of correct and authoritative Ritual. Again, the gradual decay of Sacramental teaching in the Church of England naturally involved a corresponding loss of Ritual; for Ritual without Doctrine is mere formalism, and worse than valueless; while the loss of Ritual led, in its turn, to the wider and deeper unbelief in, and dislike to, Sacramental teaching. To maintain a Sacramental system, precise and distinctly prescribed Ritual is essential; and as Symbolism is of the very essence of Sacramental teaching, it will be always found pervading and governing a correctly-framed system of Ritual.

One of the most popular of the weapons levelled at the advancing ranks of this so-called Ritualism is ridicule. Folly, trifling, childish nonsense, man-millinery, effeminacy—these are the style of epithets with which it is sought to laugh men out of the cause which Ritualism represents. It is waste of time, and thought unworthy of any one endowed with intellectual powers; it is indulgence in a mere formalism, and so a reproach to any sensible man. The effort to restore the lawful and decent Ornaments and Ritual of the Church is condemned, as lavishing attention on trifling details, and as giving undue prominence to externals. "Should the Church really give her sanction to such a system, she would be fitly termed the Church 'millinent,' rather than 'militant,'" was propounded, not in the best of taste, by one who should have known better; and the miserable and mis-timed joke found a place in the 'influential' columns of a leading journal. It is not a matter of surprise that after being exposed generation after generation to the influences of the cold, dry, unimaginative and subjective phase of Religion which the English Church has unhappily so long exhibited, the mind of the English people should fail at once to appreciate the value, or even perceive the meaning of the resuscitated Ritual and external system of the Church. The marvel is not that the Revival has experienced ridicule and some rough handling from the multitude, but, rather, that it should have met with this treatment at such hands as may now be seen casting stones at it. There would seem to be a strange lack of judgment, and a notable shortsightedness in the policy which attempts to crush and annihilate a movement such as the present Ritual Revival —for want of a better term—in the Church of England, by the force of ridicule and scorn. It is scarcely probable that those

who, finding, as they deem, good grounds for believing that in their work of restoration they have the mind, and are doing the work, of the Church Catholic, and who have on their side its authoritative practice, at least in principle, for some sixteen or seventeen centuries of the past, and that of the whole of the rest of Catholic Christendom at the present time,—it is scarcely probable, that with such a standpoint, the advocates of Ritualism will be laughed out of their position, or will be disturbed by the showers of hard words hurled so liberally upon their work and upon themselves.

The most bitter amongst the contemners of Ritualism, at least amongst the better informed, would, we suppose, scarcely venture upon open ridicule of the whole past practice of the Church Catholic, up to the Reformation, and the present practice of the whole East and West, ourselves only excepted. But even should the amazing conceit of a mere narrow and insular Anglicanism betray some into such a portentous blunder, it would avail for harm to their own cause alone. The hasty and unsparing censors of Ritualism would do well, moreover, to consider how far the course to which they are committing themselves, of ridiculing and contemning the system of Catholic Ritual, would legitimately carry them. Ritual is so essentially a part of the Sacramental system, that in the wholesale condemnation of its restoration to something approaching to the Catholic standard, in which they do not hesitate to indulge, they will be found unwittingly to have passed censure upon the Divinely-appointed Sacramental principle itself, or, having escaped such a quicksand, to have escaped the danger with difficulty. It is hardly possible to be otherwise than reminded, at times, in the face of the inconsiderate and intemperate denunciations which are on all sides cast at the Ritual phase of the Church Revival, of the timely advice of Gamaliel to the Council at Jerusalem, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

To warrant the tone adopted by very many of the opponents of Ritual in the English Church, there must have been some special dispensation accorded to ourselves, from the hitherto universally received, and, in truth, logical and legitimate consequences upon the Divine establishment, for 'alway, even to the end of the world,' of the Sacramental principle, as the mode of communication between God and man, the channel of Grace, and, in a word, of the fulfilment of the parting promise of the

Great Head of the Church, 'I will not leave you: I will come again: I am with you alway'—the promise which is the source of life, and joy, and hope, to the Church militant here in earth. That any such speciality is that of the English Church, or that she holds any such dispensation from the natural and legitimate requirements of a Sacramental system, which she teaches with no faltering voice, the *onus probandi* rests entirely upon the claimants for such liberty; and a ponderous and Sisyphus-like burden they will find it. Had the Church of England at the Reformation repudiated the Sacramental principle, and disintegrated herself from the whole Body of the Church Catholic, had she taken up the position of some other of the Reformed Communions, she might consistently have proceeded, as most of those bodies have done, to cast off likewise all the remainder of her Catholic heritage, and so to mar her outward form that she would not be so much as recognized by her sisters in the Faith. This, however, the Reformers distinctly repudiate as at any time, and in any degree, their design. The Prefaces to the Prayer Book, which the greater number probably of the opponents of a full development of the Ritual system of the Church have never read, sufficiently testify to this position.

It is not easy to understand the position sought to be maintained by those amongst us, and they are, unhappily, not a few, who, while compelled by their Ordination Vows to receive, teach, and administer that system which is the characteristic privilege of the Church Catholic, yet reject, and not therewith content, denounce as disloyal and unfaithful to the Church of which they are members, the natural, logical, and for all practical ends, necessary sequence of the promulgation of such a system, namely, a definite, exact, minute, and authoritatively prescribed Ritual. But the impossibility of the practical reception of such a contradiction, by most ordinarily constituted minds, is demonstrated by the patent fact, that while rejecting in its details the Ritual system of the Church, as burdensome, unmeaning, even absurd, such persons find themselves, of necessity, thrown back upon their own ingenuity to invent a Ritual system for themselves. Complete emancipation from the requirements of the Sacramental system is impossible; for though some have gone very far to find a way to escape, they stand pledged, at the most solemn moment of their life, faithfully to administer the Sacramental system, in which, by their Ordination Vow, they openly professed before God their unhesitating belief. Let them but honestly and unreservedly set about it, and they will discover the absolute necessity of an extensive and minute Ritual system for the merest, barest

'faithfulness' in the application, and administration of the Divine gifts entrusted to them as "Stewards of the Mysteries of God." True, as we have said, some do, to a great extent, escape the difficulty and evade the just requirements of their position. But upon all such as believe, and confess, and withal remember, that "it is required in Stewards that a man be found faithful," the necessity is at some time forced of framing for themselves a sort of Ritual system, according to their preconceived ideas, or unconsciously perhaps on some one else's model, or by mere instinct and the light of nature.

Now what is the inevitable result of this irregularity and disorder? Is it not an outward system, if even the name may be accorded to it, unmeaning, inconvenient, indecent, in the strict sense of the word—would that it were never such in its broader acceptation—various and varying, because dependent upon individual circumstances and caprice—unmeaning, strictly formal, symbolical of nothing, unless, as too often is the case, of irreverence and unsoundness of belief, or of slovenliness, neglect, and indifference, which cares, as sometimes is avowed, for none of those things? In such cases, the argument *ad absurdum*, the charge of formalism and unreality, may fairly be cast back upon our opponents. There is far more needless burdensome formality in the pompous Ritual of the so-called 'High and Dry' school, far more unedifying absurdity in the bald, meagre, awkward, or free and easy, undignified ministration of the so-called 'Low' and 'Broad' schools, than can possibly be, in fairness, charged upon any excessive development of Catholic Ritual, or even perversion of it, from which, of course, the system cannot be wholly free, by individual ignorance or self-will. Instances have been so often adduced in illustration, that it needs no more than a mere allusion to some of the more ordinary cases to recall them to our readers' minds. The fatally unmeaning practice of an oratorical preachment, or a pompous delivery, of the Divine Offices at, or in, a westward desk, or their cold, dry narration in an ordinary colloquial and conversational tone; the literally indecent and unhappily distinctive Altar Ritual of a large portion of the English Church; the lounge upon the Holy Table, ready cushioned, probably, to the greater physical comfort of the Celebrant and his assistant, symbolical, unquestionably, of the belief in No 'Real Presence' and of no honour but man's own; the worse than unmeaning, because so destructive of all realization of the Sacerdotal Office, capricious, chance division of the Divine Liturgy amongst the ministering clergy; the painful carelessness and indifference too often wit-

nessed as to every detail of the Consecration and administration, such as that on some occasions there has been reasonable question whether there has been any valid Consecration at all; the hopeless variety of practice, where the Rubric of the Prayer Book does not precisely and definitely prescribe the Ritual, so that a stranger is kept in a constant state of perplexity and apprehension, and the faithful are compelled to adapt their devotions and meditations to the personal will of the Celebrant for the day, as to pauses, position, tone, and pace; the utter uncertainty in which most Priests find themselves as to the 'doing' of a number of minor, but essentially important, acts which have to be 'done' in some way; the wretched, tumbled, soiled, or over-stiffly starched and clumsy surplice, which is the Eucharistic Vestment, worn over a short cassock, or more often worn over none at all, displaying below what should be concealed, or gaping open and exposing beneath the whole 'undress' of many of the clergy of the present day; the addition of some yards of black silk, with or without ragged ends, dignified by the name of a 'scarf,' and so at once rendered an illegal Vestment according to the Rubric of the Church of England, and a hood, it may be carelessly hanging scarfwise over the right or left arm—the whole presents a picture of awkwardness, unreality, vexatious and unmeaning formalism, such as might justly merit the very condemnation so unjustly pronounced upon the orderly, decent, significant, time-honoured Ritual—hallowed by centuries of holy observance—of the Catholic Church.

As regards Symbolism in Ritual, then, its opponents, of whatever school, are scarcely in a position to treat with ridicule and contempt those who are labouring for the remedy of these evils, under which they are content, *mirabile dictu*, still to labour. If the correct Ritual of the Eucharistic Office, for example, be to some minds excessively minute in detail, if some of the observances be obscure in significance, they are at least decent and orderly; they are, or ought to be, uniform in every place, and not at the mercy of every individual Priest; they have the *imprimatur* of the Church, and the associations of centuries, and with the memories of the greatest, holiest, and most revered among the Saints, to the deep thought, and loving reverence and devotion of some of whom, many of the Ritual observances of the Church Catholic may, without difficulty, be traced. Nay, the opponents of Ritual would seem rather to be themselves in evil case, for they cannot be emancipated from the system of the Church to which they owe allegiance, and which is, whether

distasteful or otherwise to them, thoroughly Sacramental, and by consequence, Ritual; they cannot be "free as air," as some have longed in vain to be, in the ministration of the Church's Offices, and yet they will not accept the guidance of the Church, which has thought for them, and before them, of all these things, concerning the doing of which they have often now to vex their souls: they are somewhat in the position, save as regards the sequel, of the little child, who having to perform its initial voyage across the nursery floor, half wayward, half mistrustful, disdains independently the proffered hand, and in the grief and trouble of its speedy shipwreck, learns, albeit but imperfectly, its first lesson in humility, and next time accepts a guide.

The popular charge against the restored Ritual of the Church, which is for the time called 'Ritualism,' is, that it is trifling, foolish, irritating to the public mind and eye, childish, and unmeaning. Having fairly, as we think, inquired whether such reflections may not with greater truth be cast upon the Ritualists' accusers, it shall now be our part to rebut, as far as may be, on behalf of the Church's Ritual, this unfounded charge, as unfounded as hastily and ignorantly made. It is said, we believe, of Julian the Apostate, that having been given a book in defence of the Christian Faith, he replied, "I have read it, I have understood it, and I have condemned it." S. Basil rebukes him after this manner: "You have read it, but you have not understood it; and because you have not understood it, you have condemned it[1]." "The same," says an old writer of the seventeenth century, "befalls men prepossessed, and too far engaged in the world, and with business no whit compliable with the operations of the Spirit. They behold the great things of God, and straightway think they understand them, and their censure is as sudden as their thought. Did they timely understand them, they could not possibly so slight them." (Farindon. *Sermon on the Day of Pentecost*, 1658.)

In the present agitation upon the question of Ritual Revival, there is a remarkable absence of consideration, and a strange ignoring of facts, in some of the objections urged against Ritualism, and Ritual practices. One such blow, levelled at the restored Eucharistic Vestments, and deemed by some to be of crushing force, seems peculiarly of this kind. The importance attached to the use of the Vestments, and the efforts made for their revival in our Office, are ridiculed and slighted, on the ground of the purely secular and unworthy origin of the especial Vestments. They

[1] Ἀνέγνων, ἔγνων, κατέγνων. Ἀνέγνως, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνως· εἰ γὰρ ἔγνως, οὐκ ἂν κατέγνως.

were nothing more, we are told, than the ordinary dress of the peasantry of the time, and their use in the ministration of Divine Offices goes far, therefore, to prove that the Apostolic and Primitive custom was opposed to the wearing of any distinctive dress or Vestment. Passing by the undoubted historical fact that such distinctive Vestments were worn at the Celebration of sacred Offices, in the very early ages of the Church, in what way does the alleged fact, that the primitive Vestments were identical with the common dresses of the period, granting it for argument's sake to be correct, in what way does it militate against the importance of the use of Vestments now, as a distinctive and symbolical dress, suitable for the ministration of the Divine Office? If the garments in question have become for centuries the accepted Eucharistic Vestments, what signifies, as against the importance of their use, and their symbolical significance at the present day, their origin in the peasant's, or Roman gentleman's ordinary costume? If they have been authoritatively adopted by the Church as the distinctive Vestments for the celebration of her highest Offices, it is that authoritative adoption which gives to them their distinctive character, from which the remembrance of their origin cannot detract. And, if to such Vestments there has been attached authoritatively by the Church, certain symbolical significance, the fact that they were originally without any such significance, can in no way affect the special character impressed upon them by the Church, or detract from the reality, to the worshipper, of the significance given to them, it matters not how arbitrarily, by the authority and practice, through long ages, of the Church. Such an argument might be pressed to an inconvenient length, even so as to infringe upon the Sacramental Ordinances, and the very Sacraments of the Church themselves. Were this mode of argument conclusive, or even valuable, it is not easy to see how the Sacraments, albeit ordained by our Blessed Lord Himself, would, except by common consent of reverence, which is beside the question, be safe from similar attack. Of the ancient and carefully maintained Symbolism of the Eucharistic Vestments, there can exist no doubt; and, exhibited now before the Christian worshipper, instructed in that significance, they possess the same value for instruction, and becoming fitness, which they acquired by their adoption into the service of the Church, and have since retained. This value their origin neither gave nor can take away.

In the vast Ritual and Ceremonial System of the Church Catholic, there are many usages which have no other origin than decency and convenience; but to this a symbolical

meaning has succeeded[1], and has led to the retention of the usage. These are no less valuable and instructive, because their origin is not essentially religious, or their primary object and intention are not directly symbolical. A new value and significance attach to them, immediately they are employed for the purposes of the Church. As in the case of Church Architecture[2], contact with the Church endues with a new sanctity, and elevates every form and principle of art, so with Ritual observances, or the accessories and *ornamenta* of a Ceremonial Religion. It is the very principle of a Sacramental Religion to take from common life "the outward, visible sign," and invest it with the "inward, spiritual Grace." To detract from such elevating and sanctifying power in the Church, would be to strike at the root of the whole Sacramental System.

But the argument against the restoration of the legal Vestments of the Church, based upon the ground of their secular and lowly origin, and the contempt founded thereupon, will carry the promoter further, probably, than he would be prepared to go. Of necessity, the surplice, having no nobler origin, becomes as ridiculous and unworthy of retention, as the alb or chasuble, and for consistency's sake should be contemned and put aside with them. Nor would this be all, nor could the theory be confined in its application to Eucharistic or other Vestments; and the impossibility of carrying it consistently into practice stamps the theory as vexatious and untenable[3].

We commenced with the question, "Is the Religion taught by the system of the Church of England, honestly and consistently exhibited, a Sacramental or a non-Sacramental religion?" for upon that question hangs the very existence of Ritual, and Symbolism in connexion with it. One would think that the question scarcely admitted of discussion, seeing that the religion of the Church of England, as applied to every

[1] Le Brun, *Cerem. de la Messe*, Pref. p. xliv.

[2] Durandus, *Introductory Essay*, by Neale and Webb, p. xxvii.

[3] The writer desires to direct attention to the complete and vigorous refutation and demolition of this argument, in the *Saturday Review*, No. 603, vol. xxiii. of May 18, 1867, p. 623, which has appeared since the above remarks were written. How the objection is frivolous, and overruled by almost universal religious practice, the principle of 'adoption' being the leading principle of the Christian, as it was of the Jewish Church, and of every religious system which has been popular with mankind; and how such an argument does but bear testimony to the whole history of the Church, 'the base things of the world, and things which are despised, chosen and preferred to high account,' and is suicidal on the part of the objector—all this, is demonstrated in a trenchant style.

individual member, begins, and should end, with a Sacrament, is continued and maintained through life by Sacraments. A Religion which teaches Baptism and the Holy Eucharist to be necessary to salvation, which requires Confirmation as the ordinary qualification for Communion, which provides for the Viaticum of the departing, and has not forbidden, although it no longer prescribes, the Sacrament of Unction, which retains the Catholic formulæ of Absolution, and all the essentials of the Ordinal, and which solemnizes Holy Matrimony with more elaborate religious Ceremonial than the Church of Rome, can hardly, one would suppose, be taken for other than a Sacramental Religion. Nor would it be necessary so much as to raise the question, were it not for the deplorable ignorance in which so many, nay, the great bulk, of the members of the Church of England, as to her true character, are upon examination found to be. The outcry against Ritual restoration is really an unconscious protest against a Sacramental system, and an insensate dread of something—what, the alarmists do not very precisely know—but which is, in fact, no more than that which they have long ago accepted in their own persons, and, as is said in the Confirmation Office, "by their own confession assented unto." By their very Baptism into the Church Catholic, they have pledged themselves—and with their own mouth and consent, openly before the Church, at Confirmation, have ratified and confirmed the same—"faithfully to observe such things" as their Sponsors promised for them, and they, at their Confirmation, assented unto. Members of the English Church are pledged to the system of the Church Catholic, unless they are prepared to deny the Catholicity of the English Church. Such points of faith or practice, of course, must be excepted which the English Church definitely repudiates; but granting these, every member of this branch of the Church Catholic finds himself by his Baptism, a member of a religious body, unequivocally of a Sacramental type, whose entire system is based and administered upon the principle of the communication of Divine and Supernatural gifts, by means of human and natural agencies. This is the work of the visible Church on earth, to make, so to speak, that which is invisible, visible, appreciable by, and apparent to, sense. The Sacramental System is, in a true sense, *the continuation of the Presence of Christ upon earth*, erected by Himself upon earth as MAN, and perpetuated through and in "the Church, which is His Body," to the end of the world.

Upon the reasons, for which we may believe this Divine system of Sacraments was determined by the infinite Wisdom

and Knowledge of GOD, as that by which He would govern and preserve His people, and bind them to Himself, it would perhaps be beside the present question, even did space permit, in any degree to enter. One manifest ground of such a provision only, shall be mentioned, as directly bearing upon our present subject: *viz.*, the demand, by man's complex nature, for something more than an intangible, indefinite spiritualism, appealing to and influencing but one half his being; the full and sufficient response to which, is to be found in the twofold Sacramental system, acting upon, and engaging, both great portions of man's twofold Sacramental being. In answer, as it were, to the utterance of the faithful heart, "LORD, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief"—yet not without that demand upon faith which is the condition of Divine beneficence, "According to your faith be it unto you"—the spiritual and invisible is clothed upon with a material, outward and visible form, at once the channel of communication, "the means whereby," and the aid to faith, "the pledge to assure," of the communication and reception, of the unseen. Admitting this great Sacramental principle—and how in the face of any, the least, acquaintance with the character and constitution of even our own portion of the Church Catholic it can be denied, is a marvel of human perversity and self-will—admitting this principle, we shall naturally expect to find it governing the entire scheme, and manifest in the application and administration of the system to the souls of men. Nor are we disappointed. For, in the Ritual and Ceremonial of the Church, we perceive this same principle regulating and pervading the whole, throughout, even to the minutest detail. And how, in the Wisdom and Foreknowledge of GOD, should it be otherwise? For, given, in aid of his weak faith, the Sacramental principle, given the Sacraments themselves, has not bitter experience taught us—even burnt the lesson into the hearts of some—that, if left to his own devices, and the misleading of the powers of evil, man would, in the very administration of that gift, in the very application of the system, by his blindness or perversity, go far to counteract the purpose of the dispensation, to cut himself off from the source of the streams of Grace—the river, the streams whereof make glad the city of GOD—and to bring to nought the counsel of the Most High for His creatures' good.

Let Christian people ask themselves, in all honesty, Has not the woeful maladministration of the system of the Church, the unfaithfulness, or ignorance and weakness, of the Stewards of the Mysteries of GOD, rendered to thousands, for whose salvation it

was intended, that gracious Gift of none effect? Is the Church of England to be congratulated upon the faithful and efficient dispensation, and ministration, during the three centuries past, of the things committed to her trust for the peace and safety of her people? The Sacramental principle, she has, thank GOD, conserved. She teaches it in unadulterated purity to her children. Her Priests still vow the 'faithful dispensation' of Sacramental Grace. Her Offices and Formularies speak as yet, with the unfaltering voice, and in the very words, of the Church Catholic. And they who simply and honestly accept Catholic doctrine in its integrity, find, without effort, or 'non-natural interpretations,' or 'mental reservations,' their home and place within her fold. But more than this we dare not say. The utter break down, throughout the length and breadth of England, of all Ritual system; the lawless usurpation and unmolested reign of 'private judgment'; the degradation of the dogmatic teaching of the servant of GOD delivering his Master's message, 'with all authority,' to the timid, faltering suggestion of truth, as of his own opinions, by the subservient weekly lecturer; and of the Church's grand offering of laud and praise in her objective Sacramental Worship, to the performance of a subjective, hebdomadal, religious exercise, carefully adapted to popular tastes and prejudices, with due regard to dignity, respectability, and comfort, and with an intensity of ministerial individuality as thoroughly alien to the spirit of the Church Catholic as the tone and *ethos* of the neighbouring Independent meeting-house—this, which is no too-highly coloured picture of the operation of the system of the Church in England for two centuries, had reduced her life to little more than a languid intermittent pulsation; her warmth and power to kindle men's hearts with love of GOD, to zero; her glory and beauty, to dust and ashes. 'Black,' she was indeed, but not 'comely.' Her hedge was broken down, so that all that went by plucked off her grapes, feasting themselves without fear. Her shepherds were caring for themselves, not feeding the flock; and watchers in GOD's Israel began to ask, "To what will all this grow? What will He do in the end thereof?" For the rich heritage of the English Church, as a portion of the household of GOD, seemed slipping from her grasp; much had been lost already, and the things that remained appeared only "ready to die," and "to vanish away."

Such was the condition of the Church of England, when the Movement of 1833 sounded the first note of the *réveille*, and there was an awakening as out of a long sleep, a shaking among the dry bones, and, as the true voice of 'prophesying' has con-

tinued to be heard, and with no uncertain sound, there has been a clothing again with flesh, and a standing up upon the feet, and a rallying before the varied and advancing hosts of evil, of a fragment,—small indeed and feeble, but bold and true-hearted, arrayed once more in the armour of God, and gathered under the banner of the Cross,—of the exceeding great army of the Church of the Living God.

Such was, at least in part, the result of the inability of man, once left to his own devices, even to take of, and administer to his fellows, the good Gifts of God. But the fault was his own, the misfortune ours, also, upon whom the consequences have come. When men rose up to cast off corruptions, they did not only so, but plucked up wheat with tares. When they professed to aim only at emancipation from spiritual tyranny, and oppressive subjugation of reason, and of the will, they were not careful to stem the tide of lawlessness, and private judgment, and unbelief in various forms, that came rushing in. When they did away with all that they deemed burdensome and excessive,—and there was need of caution, and of modesty, in handling with such an aim, the work of the greatest ages of the Church's history,—they were not careful enough to provide for the preservation of what they concluded to retain. And so, through human sin and weakness, the results of the Reformation bid fair, at one time, to annihilate the very being of the English Church, and blot her out from under Heaven, as a true and living Portion of the Body of Christ, a Branch of the true Vine, and a Member of the Household of God. But it was, we say, men's own fault. It was their casting off the safeguards God had given them, that brought them into this deadly peril; it was the throwing aside their weapons, that made them so feeble in the unequal fight; and it was because they dropped, piecemeal, their armour of proof, that, "overtaken by the archers," they were so sore hit and wounded.

"But," it may be asked, "do you mean to assert that it is in any sense, to the loss of Ritual, that the miseries which afflict the Church are to be traced?" We reply, Yes, understanding the term in its widest sense, as representing the *modus operandi*, the mode of carrying out the entire Sacramental System of the Church. That any one can pretend to regard the subject of Ritual with contempt, only proves that he is ignorant of its office, and importance; for, in truth, it involves the whole external system of Religion. Ritual is the system of celebrating Rites; and in the celebration of Rites are included usages, observances, forms and ceremonies of Religion—all of which *ought* to be performed—according to a prescribed order, as signified by

the etymology of the word. It is no matter of wonder, therefore, that it was, from earliest times, the wisdom of the Church minutely to regulate and prescribe her Ritual as an integral portion of her Sacramental System, in the failure of which the failure of that Divine System to accomplish its work for man, might be, and in all likelihood, nay, almost of a certainty, would be, sooner or later, involved.

In the earlier pages of this Essay, the utter inaptness and inadequacy of the Ritual, devised, in default of that prescribed and unhappily rejected, by individual men, was briefly demonstrated. It was our aim to show, that while the charge of folly, and unmeaning formalism, and burdensome ceremonial—burdensome because unmeaning—was freely brought against Ritualism, the practice of our opponents and accusers, is, itself, in a high degree open to the very same charge, and that justly, while we affirm that the accusation, as against the Ritual of the Church, is without foundation. For, as the principle of the Sacramental System is, by external and significant signs to communicate, and witness to the reality of, certain interior and all-important energies and gifts of Grace; so is the application of that system, the *modus operandi*, that is, the Ritual of the Church in its widest meaning, framed and regulated on one and the same principle. A seemly, significant, and, as regards greater points, unvarying Ritual, is calculated to ensure the intelligent reception, by the subject of the Divine operation, of the influences and gifts of Grace. While it ensures the communication, it witnesses at the same time to the nature and verity, of the Gifts communicated: It guards against imperfect or invalid administration of Sacramental graces—a point of no little moment when it is remembered, that the validity of the Sacraments is dependent upon the fulfilment of certain conditions, not on the part of the receiver, but of the Celebrant and Minister, or administrator and dispenser of the Gifts. It ensures to the greatest degree possible, reverence, decency, and order, in dealing with holy things. It exercises an influence on the mind and heart, through the *media* of the senses, strengthening faith, scattering doubts, humbling pride, kindling love, and engaging man's best energies, and highest gifts, and truest emotions, in that which is his noblest employment, and that most proper to him as the creature, Worship of, and Communion with, the Creator.

To possess such influences, and effect such results, Ritual must be, as regards all more important points, significant, and so, reasonable, intelligent, and it may be added, intelligible, also. This, it is the especial characteristic of the Ritual of the Church

to be. Deliberately, carefully minute, and after long pains and consideration, put forth by some among the greatest and holiest of the Saints of GOD—men who could say with the Apostle, we "think we have the mind of CHRIST"—the ancient, and in all more essential points, uniform Ritual of the Church Catholic, is calculated, as no invention of modern times can hope to be, to express the Mind of GOD, and to influence men. But the especial feature which qualifies it in so high a degree for this office, is its significance, or in other words, its Symbolism. "Symbolism uses real personages, real actions [and real things], as symbols of the truth" (*British Critic*, No. lxv. p. 121), and therefore, in the communication of truth, the Church employs Symbolism as the governing principle by which her Ritual is ruled. "And here it is, that Rites and Ceremonies trench so closely upon Sacraments. Every one knows how susceptible human nature is, of this kind of influence in matters of this world. How great is the power of pictures, souvenirs, names, and even other symbols, more remotely and indistinctly significant, in awakening the impressions of reverence or love. To reject this machinery as an aid to Religion, would be the hallucination of the madman, if it were not rather the work of the Evil Spirit. Now, the Catholic, partly by the help of religious associations, partly from the effect of teaching, and partly by virtue of those natural instincts which he shares with mankind in general, connects certain sacred ideas with certain visible things which are employed by the Church in the external Worship of GOD: as, for example, spiritual illumination, with the material Light; moral purification, with Water; the unctuous richness of Divine Grace, with Oil; the idea of oblation, with Incense;" &c. (*The Church and the Bible*, p. 190.)

A highly Symbolical Ritual has always been a mark of the Church Catholic, and how should it be otherwise? A Ritual system is only the methodizing a number of acts, expressive of devotion, or faith, or doctrine. Such several acts are symbolical, in that they are the fitting and natural expression of the operation, or motion, or sensation, so to speak, of the mind. We feel it to be not only right, but necessary, to accompany the inward feeling with some outward manifestation. Not only Christianity, but every development of Religion, is symbolical, and must be so. "If we were merely spirits, without bodies, or any necessary connexion with matter, it would be possible, perhaps, to worship the Great SPIRIT in an abstract way, by a sort of volition of devotion; but not being so, our souls cannot engage in adoration without the company of their material home. Hence

every effort of devotion is attended by some bodily act. Whether we lift our eyes or hands to heaven, or kneel in prayer, we show forth the necessity of our being; our body has sinned, has been redeemed, will be punished, or glorified, no less than the soul; it must therefore worship with the soul. The symbolism of bodily acts of devotion is understood by all. We have even personated Prayer by a prostrate figure, with uplifted hands." (*Introductory Essay* to Durandus, Neale and Webb, pp. lii, liii.)

It can hardly be necessary to insist upon the presence of Symbolism in the Old Testament. A moment's reflection tells us that it is full of the principle, from one end to the other; significant and typical ordinances, ceremonies, personages, things, language, meet us well-nigh in every page. Nor is it worth while to expend time and space upon confuting the preposterously false assumption, that, in all matters of external religion, the New Testament is contrary to the Old. As a matter of fact, in regard of this especial point, there is a richer field of Symbolism in the New than in the Old, stamped moreover with the authority and example of our Blessed Lord Himself. Every child knows that our Lord's teaching and language, nay even His actions, as in the working of miracles, are in the highest degree figurative and symbolical. We must not pass from the consideration of the Symbolism which we find adopted in the Gospel, without particularly observing that "the Sacraments which Christ ordained, though they are much more than symbols, are symbols in the strictest sense, as much so as Circumcision, which was appointed by God to be the sign of His covenant with Abraham, and symbolized the cutting off worldly and carnal lusts. Thus, in Baptism, Water symbolizes the cleansing operation of the Holy Ghost. And in the Lord's Supper, Bread and Wine symbolize, as well as are, the Body and Blood of Christ. It is most important to observe this, because the Sacraments are admitted by all Catholics to be essential to Christianity, and are allowed and maintained to be symbols, by those who believe them to be nothing else. He Who is Himself the very Word and Wisdom of God, acted and taught on the principle, that men receive more full and vivid impressions through the eye, than through the ear; and surely He, by so doing, has given Symbolism the very highest authority and sanction." (Compare *Symbolism not Formalism*, p. 12. By the Rev. J. W. H. Molyneux. A Sermon which contains a most exhaustive and practical argument on this subject.)

The recognition of the principle of Symbolism in Religion is, then, beyond dispute, and in such a form of Religion as that

of the Church Catholic—Sacramental in the highest degree—it cannot but hold a most important place. The wonder is, not that this should be so, but that there should be any need to urge this truth. A strong and obstinate prejudice, however, against Symbolism in Religion, actually exists, and that widely, amongst us. It is probably in no little degree founded on a kindred error and confusion to that in regard of the Real Presence of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament. As in the case of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, too many stumble at the word "spiritual," and conceive it of necessity to mean "unreal" and figurative; so, also, in regard of the principle of Symbolism in Religion, and especially in Worship and Ritual, there would appear to exist a prejudice, and suspicion, lest such a principle must be incompatible with what is real, practical, and worthy the attention of reasonable men. Impatience of any thing of the kind is felt and manifested, as trifling and unreality, calculated to detract from the practical character of Religion. The precise contrary, however, is the truth, for the more significant, and symbolical, the Religious system, the better calculated is it to act practically on the hearts of men, and draw them towards the Heavenly and eternal things, typified, and represented, by that system.

The Symbolism of Ritual should, and, rightly understood would be found to, render Worship more real, because more spiritual, and less formal. It is continually reminding the worshipper of the spiritual and Heavenly meaning of the acts in which he is taking part, investing them with reality and depth, and guarding them from degenerating into mere forms. To quote again from Mr. Molyneux's admirable Sermon:—"Formalism—which is but another name for dulness, coldness, and deadness—is the true enemy of Symbolism. They are often confounded, but they are, in reality, directly opposed to each other. Formalism is the habit of mind which rests in the mere form, and believes nothing, imagines nothing, sees nothing beyond it. Hence when a symbol is presented to a formalist, he looks upon it as nothing but a mere form; consequently, when any meaning is attached, and any value assigned to such a symbol, he can only account for it on the ground of some superstitious notion about the form itself—as though it had some inherent virtue. He revolts from this, which is his notion of symbolism, and finds no alternative but those proper to the formalist: viz., regarding the symbol as a mere form, he either takes pleasure in it as a toy, or despises it as such. Suppose we place a telescope in the hands of one who knew nothing of its

use, he might delight in it as a bright plaything, or feel contempt for it as thinking it nothing more. In either case he would be equally far from discerning its true use, as an instrument through which his eye is to be directed to the heavens, and by which he may be enabled to see something of the glory of heavenly objects. Just so with symbols" (pp. 16, 17.)

It is precisely the argument which is brought against usages such as those which we shall have occasion presently to consider, that they are ridiculous, and unmeaning forms; unmeaning of course they are, to those who do not or will not know their meaning, but not therefore unmeaning in themselves; and ridiculous, no doubt, they will appear, in the degree in which they convey no meaning. Postures, gestures, movements, are, of necessity absurd, when they express nothing intelligible. To one wholly unaccustomed to any thing of the kind, uninstructed as to the meaning of what is done, a Ritual service may very probably appear unmeaning, irritating, and, possibly, absurd. It is not the Ritual, however, that is in fault, but the spectator who is in ignorance. Yet even in such a case, one would suppose the unintelligible ceremonies to be more tolerable to reasonable beings, and less provoking, than the Ritual of anti-ritualists, such as was briefly alluded to in the earlier pages of this paper.

Very few, comparatively, are sufficiently instructed in the significance of Catholic worship, thoroughly to appreciate and enjoy it; this is the constant testimony of devotional writers even of the Roman Communion. If the Ceremonial of the Church be generally considered beautiful and imposing, even by those who understand but the material part, what effect ought it not to produce on such as really understand its spirit? "If, instead of condemning from the elevation of their ignorance," says the Abbé Martinet, "the numerous ceremonies of Catholic worship, the objectors would take the pains to penetrate the deep significance of them, and study their vast and beautiful symbolism, they would see that every thing is perfectly connected in this beautiful system, that every part has its reason, and also its effect, and that the skill with which the Church has introduced so great a variety into the very limited plan of its Liturgy cannot be sufficiently admired. What do we find in this series of mysterious pictures which it presents to our eye in the course of the year? Nothing less than the history of the world, from the Word which created Heaven and earth, to the Word which is to produce a new Heaven and a new earth; the history of the Redeemer, from the day He was promised to guilty man, to the day when He will receive into His glory,

the last in time, of the elect; the history of the Christian Church, from the period when it was sighing in the Catacombs, to the final period, when, pursued into the depths of the deserts by triumphant impiety, it will see the banner of the spouse unfurled in heaven, and will entone an eternal Hosannah." (*Religion in Society*, Martinet, vol. ii. p. 236.) It is no matter of surprise, that, the principle of Symbolism being missed, the objector to ceremonial and Catholic worship experiences such irritation and weariness at its 'formalism,' as it appears to him. But the longest Office would not leave room for *ennui* if those present could follow closely the mind and thought of the Church. It is much more wonderful, that intelligent and cultivated minds can conceive and express such an estimate of the vast system they are so ready to ridicule and condemn. There is a degree of presumption, not to say impertinence, which, were it not so disastrous, would from its unconscious self-conceit, appear ridiculous in the extreme, in the calm assurance with which all that labour and thought, and deep spiritual penetration, of men of rare learning and sanctity, which built up the whole external fabric of the Church's system, are contemned and ignored, and the result declared to be puerile and unmeaning, and unworthy the attention of reasonable men. To accept this, involves rather too great a strain upon faith in the intellectual power, and developed wisdom, even of the nineteenth century.

The very detail and minuteness of Religious Symbolism, may, not unnaturally, be irritating to minds entirely unaccustomed to detail or minuteness in Religion at all. But this is no condemnation of the principle; although it is a fair argument in favour of common sense and reserve in the restoration of usages long fallen into abeyance. The attempt to include in the symbolical principle almost every point, that man's oblation may be entire, lacking nothing, and leaving no avenue for the approach of earth and self, would surely seem to demand something better than contempt and ridicule, at the hands of men in earnest, and if so, conscious of sufficient lack of service, in their own life, towards God. But to many minds, the very minuteness of application of the symbolic principle will appear but an aggravation of offence, rather than a valid plea for the system. There is no help for this but patience and forbearance. A sufficient answer can at least be given to the charge of trifling puerility, and unmeaning formalism, and "pernicious nonsense," in the widely-extending system of symbolic significance, which is found pervading the entire Ritual of the Church Catholic.

The scope of the present Essay would seem to limit the exami-

nation into this principle, mainly to its general exhibition in the outward system of the Church, *e.g.*, her Seasons and Festivals, with the Ceremonial of an ordinary Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and a few words upon the legal Vestments of the Celebrant. The application of Symbolism to Religion, in Church building and arrangement, in the language and teaching of the Church, and in the religious employment of Art and Science, would reach beyond practicable limits, if not beyond the legitimate boundaries of our subject. Symbolism in ceremonial, and in the *general* order and arrangement of Catholic worship, only, will be touched upon in the succeeding pages of this Essay.

First in order may be noticed the division of the year, adopted for purposes of religion by the Church, a division eminently philosophical, and corresponding with the three great periods in the history of Religion, viz. that previous to, during, and subsequent to, the Ministry of our Blessed Lord. The first division of the year, comprising the time from Advent to the Nativity, corresponds to the four thousand years of preparation, the sighs, and the longings of the old world for the coming of a Redeemer. The second, which extends from Christmas to the Ascension, includes the entire Life of Jesus Christ on earth, and is the great Ecclesiastical Season of the year. The third, which commences at Pentecost, and ends with the Feast of All Saints, represents the existence of the Church from the descent and indwelling of the life-giving Spirit, to the accomplishment of the number of the elect. This life of the Church—the succession of its marked epochs in the Feasts and Seasons of the year, retracing as it were for us the life of the human race and the entire history of Christianity, terminates in the Feast of Heaven, for all is to conduct us thither in the end, and Heaven is the end of all. A corresponding character is stamped upon the teaching of the Church in her Offices, and upon the Offices themselves, in these three several divisions. The first is marked by the note of preparation and the warning of the coming of the King to take account of His servants, and bears upon it the sober and penitential tone which we accept as proper to Advent. The second is chiefly a Season of rejoicing with the Church, because of the Presence of the Bridegroom, interrupted only by her going with Him into the wilderness for the forty days of Lent, and increasing in glory that culminates in the great Feasts of Ascension and of Pentecost. The third exhibits the ordinary course of worship and of teaching, the days of the Church until the evening's "work and labour," the close of the Ritual year [1].

[1] The division is, in the intention of the Church, exhaustive, for Advent

Next in order, because next, perhaps, in importance, in the Church's scheme, is her Festal system, the succession in due and carefully adjusted order, of her Feasts. In these we have, as a French devotional writer says, "an apprenticeship of Heaven[1]," an image, faint, it is true, but often reproduced, and so, powerful for good, of the Eternal Feast which is to come. They are as trees of refreshing foliage, and flowers of bright hues, planted and scattered by the love of our Holy Mother, here and there on the way of sorrows, which exiled man must so hardly traverse before he reaches his eternal home.

The very name of 'Feast' is itself a lesson of philosophy, contrasting powerfully with the tears, the sore travail, and the woes of life. It declares to man his whole history, past, present, and to come; tells him of what he was, is now, and may yet one day be; encourages, consoles, invigorates him; reminds him of his earliest destiny, his fall, his restoration, and the Joys, unfeigned and unending, which await him. It is no good sign, that in the religion of the English people there is so little joy, so few glad Feasts and Holidays, which poor and rich, young and old, may keep together, such as those bright and happy 'Fêtes,' which our Continental neighbours so well know how to keep, and which it does one good to see. But it is for the very class who, amongst us, come in for no share, or next to none, in the rare Feast days that we keep, the poor, the labourer, the artisan, the tradesman, nay, the merchant and the statesman; it is for such, on whom the curse of toil weighs most heavily, that this system is principally meant. And one would think that it were needful, as much for the body as for the soul. Man is not a mere machine; and incessant labour wears him away before his time. "It is not sufficient," says Rousseau, "that a man have bread: he must also have days of rest, in which he can eat in peace."

It is in truth the interest of the world and of society to find a truer wisdom than that which guides its present course; for the spoliation of Holidays, and days of rest, affects the well-being of mankind, and it cannot too often be repeated, that Religion, which apparently has no aim but everlasting felicity in another world, yet brings about man's happiness in this.

Another point in the significance of the festal system of the

formerly extended over six weeks, beginning with the Feast of S. Martin, immediately after the octave of All Saints. The Church of Milan, true to the ancient rule, yet observes the six weeks of the primitive Advent.

[1] "Nous envisageons les fêtes chrétiennes comme un apprentissage du ciel."—*La Religion dans le Temps et dans l'Eternité.* Gaume.

Church, is its harmony with the seasons of the year no less than with the requirements of our own hearts. Each one of the greater Feasts is celebrated at a season especially adapted to kindle and develope the feelings which it is the Church's mission to inspire; and so, physical creation unites with Religion in the promotion of the end for which both have their being—the happiness of man. Suppose, for sake of illustration, that instead of celebrating in winter the feast of Christmas, we were to keep it in the bright warm days of summer, do we not perceive how far less would be the sympathy with the new-born babe of Bethlehem? How much more difficult to stir in the heart, in the midst of burning heat, lively sympathy for the Little Infant in the cold, born at the wintry midnight, in a rocky cave, every where exposed to the cutting blasts of the cruel wintry wind. Give back to the Feast its due position on the 25th December, and the harmony is at once apparent, and without effort the heart experiences all which it is desired to excite within it. So, further, with the burst of spring, Easter can better symbolize the Resurrection from the dead of that which "is not quickened except it die." (1 Cor. xv. 36.) At Ascension tide, "soft clouds," and kindlier skies look down upon us as we lift our gaze, and, as the Christian poet of our day has sung—

> "In the strength of love,
> Pursue the bright track ere it fade away,
> My Saviour's pathway to His home above."

And at Whitsuntide, the bright, warm, but not too scorching days of early summer, giving new life to the sick and feeble, comfort and enjoyment to all, harmonize with the blessing of the season, and aid in symbolizing the genial, kindling, revivifying influence of the Life-giving Spirit.

The order and arrangement of the whole external system of the Church is so contrived as plainly to symbolize her office towards her people, and to exhibit her life and energies side by side with the energies and life of the world, sanctifying and exalting, by the power of the hidden life with God, the entire circle of our daily life in communion with our fellow-men. The whole year is, as it were, thus taken up, and sanctified by Religion; and we see that, during its course, there is not a truth which the Church does not preach, not a virtue or grace which she does not put forth for our imitation, not a chord of the heart which she does not strive to touch, so that "one is led," says the French author before quoted, "to feel of each several solemnity

that which one is forced to say of every Christian verity, 'Si elle n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer.'" (Gaume.)

The majesty of God, and the sanctity of Religion, require that the outward form by which God is approached, and Religion is brought into contact with men, so that it may fulfil its chief end, to unite God and man, shall be such as becomes the greatness of His Majesty, and such also as will inspire man's heart with suitable sentiments of reverence and devotion. The great principle that will be found ruling the outward system of the Church, is the acknowledgment of a Present God; and by consequence, the aim of her Ritual is, throughout, to represent this great foundation truth before her people, and to impress it deeply upon their minds; and, at the same time, to furnish a definite, and, as far as possible, uniform mode of giving to God the external Worship of the body—required of man, as a being possessed of body as well as spirit—of such sort as may most vividly express the inward disposition of the soul. This twofold object should be borne in mind in the consideration and contemplation of a System of Symbolic Ritual, such as that of the Church Catholic. For example:—by the posture of kneeling, or bowing the body, we express our feelings of humility and dependence, of respect and reverence, and honour God by the outward manifestation of those feelings towards Him; at the same time, the reality of His Presence is impressed upon our hearts, and the devotion and reverence of our souls is increased, as experience testifies, by the outward homage and reverence of our bodies. The Ritual of the Offices of the Church, for the Administration of the Sacraments, ordered on this principle, will be found to represent either the dispositions with which we ought to receive them, or the effects which they should produce in our souls, or the responsibilities and obligations we incur by receiving them, or, it may be, all these, at one and the same time.

One principal object in the ordering of the Ritual of the Church, is to mark off the Worship of the Sanctuary from the ordinary actions of the world, and to sever between it and common life. This is, of course, the aim of Symbolism in Church architecture and arrangement, and no less of the application of the same principle to the order of the Worship itself, carried on within the material building. The world is to be left without, put off at the church door, and kept from the eye by the painted window, which interposes heavenly subjects, and checks the wandering of the gaze to earthly things. So, the very language of Divine Worship, lifted, in one portion of the Church Catholic, above the 'vulgar' tongue, by the prevalent use of Latin, is,

where the vernacular has been restored, as with ourselves, separated from that of common life, by the prescribed musical recitation, commonly, but incorrectly, termed 'intoning,' and by the Plain Chant of the Church. 'Intoning' commonly falls under the condemnation of the opponents of Ritual as 'absurd,' 'unmeaning,' 'unnatural.' That it need not be 'absurd' is clear from the constant employment, in music, of monotonic and slightly inflected recitation, frequently identical with portions of the Church's Song. That it is not unmeaning, but the reverse, is apparent from the fact that it is adopted with special design: —*viz.* 1. To separate the language of GOD's House from that of common life, by providing a different tone in which to address Almighty GOD from that in which we speak with one another. 2. To ensure greater reverence, and to guard against individual peculiarities or display, in the offering the Prayers and Praises of the Church to GOD. The preaching, or elaborately varied reading of the Sacred Offices, is not merely unmeaning, but worse, in that it can hardly fail to convey the impression—and we know well that it has for years so operated in the Church of England —that the prayers are for the edification and instruction of the people, rather than the utterance of their hearts to GOD. If we once realize that we are addressing the Almighty, one would think that our instinctive impulse would be to speak as simply, quietly, and with as little of self about our manner and voice as possible. 3. This mode of offering Divine Worship is likewise ordered for the greater facility of response, and the union of many voices in Prayer or Praise. Wherever this custom of the Church is departed from, there is commonly but little response or heartiness of worship, or if there be such, the effect is symbolical of any thing, rather than unity and concord. The Ecclesiastical intonation or recitation of the Divine Offices is therefore not unmeaning, neither is it unnatural, except so far as it is different from the ordinary tone of voice, and in that degree achieves the desired end; but, on the contrary, it is the experience of most persons, that in reading or reciting prayers aloud they *naturally*, not of intent, fall into a musical note, almost or altogether monotonic. The devotions of a little child, if said aloud, are, almost without exception, and involuntarily, intoned. The Church of England in directing, in the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, that certain portions of the Liturgy, and Offices be *said*, intended by this term, a musical, or at least a monotonic recitation.

The same principle is manifest in the use of the ancient Plain Song, or Gregorian Music, in Divine Service. "To reform the

too florid and artificial style, which, towards the decline of the sixth century, had imperceptibly insinuated itself into the Church Service, and to introduce a pure and more appropriate taste, S. Gregory established a school of singers at Rome, an institution which is still discernible in the choir of the Pope's chapel, where many of the graces peculiar to the ancient style are still exclusively, but scrupulously preserved, solely by tradition. To this school, founded by S. Gregory, the whole of the Western Church, but particularly the English portion of it, was indebted for its beautiful and appropriate style of Ecclesiastical music." (*Hierurgia*, Dr. Rock, pp. 82, 83.) The simple and severe grandeur of such music is significant of the solemnity of the Service in which it is employed, and the consequent necessity for a grave, severe, and chastened tone, even in the Praises of the Sanctuary, because it is "none other than the House of God," and His Presence fills its courts.

The Ritual order and arrangement of the worship of the Church Catholic exhibits the same symbolical principle. The Altar, which symbolizes the Body of Christ—or according to Durandus (Ed. Neale and Webb, p. 42), "the higher Altar is God the Trinity"—is the centre of Worship. Before, and nearest to it, therefore, are placed the Priests, the Ministers of the Altar, those appointed to offer for the people, and speak in their name. Next in order are the choir, so called from the harmony in their chanting, or from the derivation of the word "chorus," which is from *chore* or *corona*. For in early times they stood like a crown round the Altar, and thus sang the Psalms in one body. Subsequently, from S. Ignatius, came the practice of antiphonal chanting. The two choirs represent the Angels and the Spirits of just men, while they cheerfully and mutually excite one another in the holy exercise: (*Ibid.* pp. 26, 27.) The custom has reference to the vision of Isaiah, in which he saw the Seraphim, crying one to another, "Holy, Holy, Holy," and was adopted from the Jewish worship into the Christian Church. And then, separated from the choir, and filling the body of the church, are the faithful, assembled "to ask pardon for sins and to assist in the Divine praises, and to hear God's proceedings with the good and ill, and learn to receive the knowledge of God, and that we may feed on the Lord's Body." (*Ibid.* pp. 36, 37.)

Men and women sit apart, a custom received, according to the Venerable Bede, from the ancients—the men on the southern, the women on the northern side—Durandus says, to signify that the Saints most advanced in holiness should stand against the greater temptations of this world, and they who be less

advanced, against the less, or that the bolder and stronger sex should take their place in the position fittest for action. Thus all are arranged in order for the Divine Service. The Priest at the Altar, standing to offer; the choir, to lead the praises of the multitude; the people, the great body of worshippers, assisting with heart and voice in the praises of the courts of the House of God.

It is, naturally, upon the chief Act of the Church's Worship, the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, that she has concentrated her chief attention, and has surrounded It with every outward sign of reverence and respect; and to the Ritual of the Celebration, and to its symbolic meaning, the limits of this Essay require that our further consideration of the subject be confined. This is, moreover, the point, the examination of which will, perhaps, at the present moment, be most convenient; since it is to the restored Ritual of the Eucharistic Sacrifice that the principal objections of our opponents are most commonly taken. Indeed, for some considerable time, the Ritual Revival was permitted to proceed unchallenged, so long, it would seem, as it did not manifest itself in immediate relation to the Holy Eucharist. A feeling obtained in many quarters, that this was ground too sacred to be ventured on, the Celebration was too solemn an Act for the admission of such trifling considerations as the details of Ritual and Ceremonial. Hence in the earlier days of the Movement it was common to meet with a choral and ritual Celebration of other Offices, as Matins and Evensong, while the Holy Eucharist stood alone in the absence of such outward notes of the care and reverence of the Church. Choral and Festal Matins and ante-Communion Office, followed by the plainest and most meagre Celebration of the Holy Mysteries—this was for a time the rule of many churches to which the spirit of restoration and revival had extended. But this, manifestly, could not long continue. The Holy Eucharist had gradually ceased to hold Its due position at the head and front of Catholic Worship in the Church of England, and, for a time, the inconsistency seems scarcely to have been perceived. The further development of the Movement, however, gradually restored true Catholic views of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the great Act of Christian Worship, the position which It claimed since the Day of Pentecost; and the first care then began to be, in the minds of Church restorers, the restoration to the Divine Liturgy of somewhat of its due honour, glory, and beauty. Hence the re-appearance of the "lawful Ornaments of the Church and the Ministers thereof at times of their ministration," and the endeavour to bring the Ritual of the

Celebration into conformity with the Rubrics and Ritual directions of the Church, which have marked the history of the few years last past of the English Church.

Against no portion of the Revival of her life and discipline has more opposition been raised, than against this one point, which must of necessity be the chief and ultimate centre of all Ritual Restoration. Recognizing the popular estimate of 'Ritualism,' so called, it is not wonderful that more impatience should be exhibited at its connexion with the Eucharist than with any other portion of the Church's system. If Ritualism be regarded as the trifling, puerile, worthless folly which it is now common to represent it to be, the more in earnest and the more really devout persons are themselves, the greater would be their jealousy of the infringement of the supposed evil upon the more solemn portions of Religion. This is one of the remarkable testimonies to the truth which we see so often unwittingly borne by sincere though misinformed and prejudiced members of the Church. Unmeaning forms and foolish ceremonies, in connexion with the Blessed Sacrament, are justly felt to be irritating and offensive, even with the more subjective faith concerning It which would among such prevail. But inasmuch as the Forms and Ceremonies of the Church are not empty and unmeaning, it is to the Holy Eucharist that they are most carefully and reasonably devoted.

Another instance of the remarkable manner in which opponents so often unconsciously bear testimony to the truth, is to be found in the inconsistency which notably characterizes the present agitation against Ritualism. While it is contemned and scouted as folly, and trifling, and the like, it is at one and the same time denounced as a most portentous evil, expressive and symbolical of false Doctrines, repudiated and protested against by the Church of England, and calculated to undo all the labour of the Reformers, and reduce the English Church to its former bondage and corruption! Leaving the objectors to reconcile as best they may, this inconsistency, we thank them for the admission contained in their more serious objection. The chief point and value of all Ritual is, that it symbolizes and expresses, and at the same time enshrines and protects, Dogmatic Truth. Ritualists, so called, have no desire to escape under the guise of harmless nonentities. Ritual unquestionably does symbolize Doctrine, and therefore has been so carefully legislated for by the Church. Now the great point and source of all reality in the theory of Catholic Worship is the Presence of our Incarnate Lord, in very truth and deed, in His Church, "alway, to the end of the world." To this foundation-truth, give all the ancient Liturgies, by their

whole symbolical system, by the very construction of their Ritual, perpetual, and abundant witness. It is the key-stone of the fabric of the Church's Worship, as it is indeed the source of her life and being. It is the truth which gives reality and efficacy to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," "Do This in Remembrance of Me." The fulfilment of this Divine Command has ever been the one chief Act of the Christian Church—the "showing forth the LORD's Death till He come." The offering of the Holy Eucharist gathers round It a ceremonial, symbolical throughout, with more or less distinctness, of this great Truth and its attendant Doctrines. Failing this belief, it is no matter of wonder that the Ritual of the Church appears unmeaning, empty formalism. Accept it, and the chief Act of the Church's Worship receives its true character, and stands forth as the great dramatic action which represents continually before GOD and man, as the Prayer Book declares, the one full, perfect, sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

A suitable and symbolical System of Ritual and Ceremonial Worship then, has its place, nay more, is demanded for, the 'reasonable service,' which must be the result of our faith in a very Present LORD. The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice—than which no Doctrine has more unanimously the consent of all Antiquity—is the key to the symbolic Ritual of the Church, and that system of symbolic Ritual is designed to be, and should be, the continual witness to, and safeguard, of that cardinal Truth. Our Blessed LORD Himself offered the first Eucharist, after the Paschal Supper, in the Upper Room at Jerusalem, the same night in which He was betrayed. The Apostles were then invested by Him with the power and prerogative of 'doing' what He had done, and of committing that prerogative to other 'faithful men,' who should succeed them in their Office. The Apostles and their immediate successors in the early Church were, history testifies, most faithful and exact in exercising the sacred Office and prerogative conferred upon them: and not only was 'the first day of the week' marked regularly by the 'ministration,' 'the breaking of the Bread,' perhaps with some more solemn and impressive ceremonial; but also, each day in the week was consecrated with the Oblation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. For in Primitive times, we are distinctly told, in the Acts of the Holy Apostles, that the Early Church was wont to "break Bread" daily from house to house, 'with gladness and singleness of heart.' The Apostles offered, as Representatives of their LORD, by His direct authority; their successors, to the

end of the world, in the Priestly Office, 'stand ministering,' as, in their turn, representatives of the Great High Priest. Hence the greatness of this prerogative of the Sacerdotal Office. The Priest acts under Christ our Lord, as His visible substitute, not in his own name or by his own authority, but in the Name and Person of Christ, using, at the Consecration, His very words—"This is My Body: This is My Blood." The Ritual of the Church, therefore, provides that the Priest *stands* at the Altar—the position of Sacrifice—to signify his Office as vicegerent of, and substitute for, our Lord Himself, Who in truth here offers Himself, and is offered by the hands of the Priest—fulfilling thus, continually, His Office as High Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedec, which Order consisted principally in this, that he offered up Bread and Wine in Sacrifice. Our Lord is therefore Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedec, because of the resemblance between the Offering of Melchisedec and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which He instituted and still continues to offer by the Ministry of His Priests, under the outward Form of Bread and Wine. Where the rule of the Church is violated, and the Priest *kneels* to exercise his Office, he fails to express the nature of his prerogative, and to exhibit, for the edification of the faithful, the due 'ministration' of his Priesthood. For the same reason the Priest is robed, for the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in Vestments to which symbolical meaning has been attached, signifying the representative character of the Priest. As these will be alluded to more particularly hereafter, suffice it now to say, generally, that the Eucharistic Vestments symbolize the garments worn by our Blessed Lord during the successive stages of His Passion, and the bonds by which He was 'numbered with the transgressors,' and 'led as a sheep to the slaughter,' along the Way of Sorrows.

But although the Priest thus exercises his representative Office, and acts in the Name of, and as impersonating, the Great High Priest Himself, he cannot but remember his own unworthiness as sinful man, for the exceeding greatness of this Office. The Ritual of the Church provides, therefore, for his preparation by the prayers said (with us in secret) at the foot of the Altar before commencing the Divine Office; *e.g.* the 43rd Psalm, *Judica me*, the *Confiteor*, or Confession, and a Prayer for sanctification as he ascends the Altar steps. These preparatory devotions are performed with the hands joined and with bended head, expressive of penitence and humility, and the spirit of the publican, who would not lift up so much as his eyes toward heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, "God be merciful to

me a sinner." The custom of striking the breast at the *Confiteor* signifies indignation against self, and a desire that our hearts may be bruised by compunction for our sins. This preparation finished, the Priest begins the Office on the North or Gospel Side of the Altar, to reserve the centre, before the Cross, or Crucifix, for the more solemn portions of the Service. This custom in the English Rite interprets the old division of the Altar into *dexter, sinister,* and middle portions, as referring to the Crucifix or Cross, not to the Priest; the Roman practice is grounded upon the latter view.

The Priest, having privately said the 'Introit,' or 'Entrance' upon the Office, which varies with the day or season (and at High or Solemn Celebrations, is sung by the choir), and the LORD'S Prayer and Collect for Purity, with which the English Office opens, aloud, turns to the people for the reading of the Decalogue—the custom of reading a portion of the Old Testament before the Holy Eucharist being very ancient—his ordinary position at the Altar is facing the east, as 'ministering' *for,* and not *to* the people, but to GOD. The *Kyries,* earnest supplications for mercy, fitly prefacing the Celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, are said by the Server or Assistant, at plain or Low, and sung by the choir at High Celebrations, the people in either case uniting. At the resumption of the Collects, the Priest turns again to the Altar, having previously called upon the faithful by the "Let us pray," to unite in spirit in the succeeding Collects. He lifts and extends his hands, in saying this exhortation, to move the faithful to lift their hearts to GOD. In the English Office the prayer for the Sovereign occurs here. With the Collect or Collects for the Day, commences the Eucharistic Office proper. These, the Priest recites with hands extended and raised, as the ancient and most natural attitude of prayer. The early Church elevated not the hands only, but the arms, in imitation of the prayer of CHRIST upon the Cross[1]. For convenience, the Western Ritual directs that the hands be separated and raised, open, to the level of the shoulders, and according to Tertullian, "*cum modestia et humilitate.*" (Tertull. l. *De Orat.* c. 13.) It is worthy of note that the gestures of the prescribed Ritual of the Church are invariably of such sort; excessive and exaggerated Ceremonial, is not of the mind of the Church, but of private judgment.

It may be well here to observe, that the treatment of so wide a subject as the complete Ritual of the Eucharistic Office, even

[1] Authorities—Le Brun, Rock, Cochin, De Herdt, Innocent III., *passim.*

though not including High or Solemn Celebrations, and the many accessories of Ritual, must, from the necessary limits of this Essay, be of a cursory character. More, indeed, is not proposed, than a general review of the Ceremonial, and arrangement of the Divine Office, with its symbolic teaching. This, however, it is hoped, will be sufficient to show that the Ritual of the Church is not a mass of unmeaning formalism, suitable for 'dark ages,' but a widely significant, and reasonable, system, framed with especial care, to express, preserve, and communicate to sense, the great Truths which it enshrines.

To return: The Collect—which gathers up, collects, the supplications of the people—ended, the Priest moves to the right, or South corner of the Altar, to read the Epistle. The Scripture lections in the Divine Liturgy originated in the custom in the Jewish Church of reading 'Moses and the Prophets every Sabbath day' in the Public Assembly. Tertullian and S. Justin the Martyr bear testimony to its adoption by the early Christian Church. The Epistle is so called because generally a portion of the Epistles of S. Paul, or other of the Apostles, and at one time called indifferently Epistle or Apostle; it is read before the Gospel, because the preaching of S. John Baptist was to prepare the way for the Word of GOD, and is read on the South Side of the Altar, that the Gospel may be read at, and towards, the North, *i.e.* to the unconverted. The custom of sitting during the Epistle originated in the Jewish and early Christian usage of adding to the Scripture lection comments and explanations; though it is here worthy of remark that there is no rubrical authority for the congregation to sit during the recitation of the Epistle. The faithful are ordered to kneel at the First LORD'S Prayer, and to stand at the Holy Gospel; they are nowhere commanded to sit. At the time of Sacrifice, either standing or kneeling is the fitting posture for the worshipper; and this custom might be restored, at least at Low Celebrations. The Church very early introduced between the Epistle and Holy Gospel, a Psalm, or sundry verses of a Psalm, with Alleluias, the intention being to unite prayer with instruction, and to signify the joy of the faithful for the blessings of the Gospel of CHRIST. On certain special occasions, Hymns were also sung immediately before the Holy Gospel, to express (with the exception of *Dies Iræ*, at Burials) joy, and gladness. These *Sequences* or *Proses*, are some of the finest of the ancient Hymns of the Church; *e.g. Victimæ Paschali* for Easter, *Veni Sancte Spiritus* for Pentecost, *Lauda Sion* for the Blessed Sacrament, and *Dies Iræ* for Funerals. These Anthems or *Graduals*—from having formerly been chanted from the Altar

steps—and *Sequences,* or Hymns which *follow* the Epistle, are not prescribed in the English Office, and, ordinarily, the Holy Gospel succeeds immediately upon the conclusion of the Epistle. As the Epistle symbolizes the preaching of S. John Baptist as the Forerunner of the WORD, these devotions are taken to signify the acknowledgment of faith and joy, after such announcement, as when S. Andrew finds his brother Simon, and says, "We have found the Messias," and S. Philip finds Nathanael, and tells him, "We have found Him of Whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write [1], JESUS of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph."

The next point in the Ritual of the Holy Eucharist is one which forcibly illustrates the extreme unfairness in treatment which the Church of England experiences at the hands of many of her own children. They would impose all manner of restrictions upon her action, pare down her Ceremonial to the lowest possible standard, denude her system of life and warmth, and then, having bound her hand and foot with the grave clothes of a lifeless respectability, taunt her, as in mockery, with coldness, and rigidity, and unmeaning formalism. It is not too much to say that many English Churchmen have a dread of according to her full liberty of action: a sort of feeling, were it analyzed, that such liberty would carry them further than they are prepared to go—that there is a range within that liberty which they are pleased inconsistently to term 'excessive.' Having reduced the form of the Church of England to a mere ghastly skeleton of its true self, they then murmur at the dryness, and complain that they have bones for flesh, deadness and coldness for life and warmth. It is small matter for wonder that in the gaunt, angular, ill made-up 'lay figure' to which they had reduced the Church's outward frame, men should find little comeliness or beauty to attract them. With mangled Services, and a worse than mangled Ritual, the outward Worship of the Church might well be deemed awkward and unmeaning. With symbolism obscured, telling points missed, contrasts and antitheses, unity and harmony, ignored, no wonder that some feel, if they would speak out, that the Ritual of the Church is not worth fighting for; they probably know not, and have never had a chance to know, what that Ritual in its true form really is.

How many among those who glory in calling themselves 'Gospel Christians,' and clamour for the 'pure Gospel,' have any idea, that in the very Ritual they hate and denounce, as obscuring and hindering that 'pure Gospel,' there is careful

[1] Innocent III., *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio.*

provision for the exhibition and proclamation of their great principle? that where Ritual is most minutely and completely carried out, there the paramount importance and supreme dignity of the Gospel of CHRIST are most unequivocally asserted and scrupulously guarded? In every ancient Liturgy of the Church, the honour of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST has ever been conspicuously marked. Ever since the Books of the Holy Gospel were written, there has been a special lection from them in the Divine Office, that the faithful should gain intimate knowledge of the precepts and actions of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and publicly evidence how much they reverence and how much they love them. (Le Brun, vol. i. p. 214.) At High or Solemn Celebrations, which cannot here be noticed, the honour of the Holy Gospel forms one of the most notable features of the Ritual, and this in the Latin, Greek, Ethiopian, Armenian, and every Liturgy. Following upon the Epistle, to signify the preaching of our LORD, after the preparatory mission of the Baptist, the Gospel is read at the North Side of the Altar, facing northwards, signifying the stilling of the dry and cold blast of the north wind, as the breath of the evil spirit[1], by the power of the Word of GOD proceeding forth, as a warm and gentle breathing, from the South: and, because it is the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST, it is addressed to the North, which the Church, in accordance with Holy Scripture, designates as the place of sinners, for our LORD said:—"I came to call not the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

The announcement of the Gospel is met by the response, "Glory be to Thee, O LORD," and the termination marked also, by a like act of praise, "Praise be to Thee, O CHRIST," with or without the addition of the words, "for this Thy glorious Gospel." Glory to Him who came to disperse the mists of ignorance by the light of Divine Truth; Praise also to Him for His unspeakable gift in the Gospel, and Ministry of the Word.

The 'Mass of the Catechumens' ended here. "The Church, in A.D. 444, at the Council of Orange and Valencia, in Spain, ordered that the Gospel be read here, after the Epistle, and before the Oblation, that the penitents and catechumens might hear the salutary instruction of JESUS CHRIST." It may be added, that the faithful stand at the Gospel to express respect, and readiness to obey the precepts of the Word: and also, that

[1] Out of the north an evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land (Isa. i. 14. Compare also Isa. xiv. 12, 13). Le Brun, De l'Evangile. Cochin. Dr. Rock.

the Gospel, preceded by prayers, Scriptures, the teaching of the Apostles and prophets, "represents the fulness of time, when the eldest born of the Father, after being announced by His servants and ministers, comes in person to cultivate his vine, and sow the seed in his field."

The Word of the Gospel having been received into the heart, the recitation of the Creed follows: for "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." The posture of standing is continued to signify readiness to defend, if necessary, the faith, and oppose such as may presume to question its veracity. The position of the Creed, at the commencement of the second portion of the Office, signifies the desire of the Church that all should approach the Oblation in the spirit of true faith, producing the conviction of the greatness and majesty of Him to Whom it is offered, and of the tender mercy of our LORD, Who vouchsafed to become a Victim, and to die for us upon the Cross. The Priest, in commencing the Creed, lifts and extends his hands, signifying the interior elevation of the heart; he stands in the midst of the Altar, opposite the Cross, the more solemn portion of the Office having commenced. At the words 'in One GOD,' he re-unites his hands. When the clauses announcing the mystery of the Incarnation are reached, "And was incarnate by the HOLY GHOST of the Virgin Mary, and WAS MADE MAN," he does reverence in honour of 'the wondrous humility of our LORD,' for, according to the words of S. Augustine:—"A GOD that is humble should be approached only in humility," and in acknowledgment also, of the Divinity of the Incarnate SAVIOUR, "Very GOD and Very MAN." At the conclusion, at the clause "the Life of the World to come," he signs himself with the sign of the Cross, in token that "we look for the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the World to come," by virtue of the Cross of CHRIST, Who is raised again to His glorious Life, in order to raise, if they will, to the same glory, the faithful who are His members, and to bear them within the Heaven on high, which He has opened to them by His Ascension [1].

A more solemn part of the Divine Office begins with the 'Offertory,' a verse, or verses, of Holy Scripture, said by the Priest, facing the Altar. The name is derived from the custom of receiving at this point the offerings of the faithful—these formerly were principally the Elements for Consecration; now, as a rule, they are offerings of money for the work and service

[1] Cochin on the Creed. Le Brun, La Manière de dire le Credo.

of the Church. The Priest, having said the Offertory, spreads upon the Altar the white Linen Cloth, or Corporal, on which presently will be laid the Body—*Corpus*—of our LORD. The Corporal signifies the Linen Cloth in which was wrapped the Body of CHRIST when taken down from the Cross and deposited in the Tomb (Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1222). The εἰλητὸν of the Greek Church implies the same meaning. S. Isidore, the friend of S. Chrysostom, says of it in an epistle:—"The piece of Linen Cloth which is spread under the Divine Gifts, serves the same purpose as the one employed by Joseph of Arimathea. For as that holy man enveloped with a winding sheet, and deposited in the Sepulchre, the Body of the LORD, through which the universal race of mortals participated in the Resurrection; in the same manner, we who sacrifice Bread of proposition on the Linen Cloth (or Corporal) without doubt find the Body of CHRIST." (Dr. Rock's *Hierurgia*, pp. 74, 75.) This testimony to the ancient symbolism of the corporal is of especial value, in that it declares unequivocally the faith of the early Church in the Real Presence of the Body of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament.

Having removed the Pall from the Chalice (pall from *pallium*, cloak or covering), the Priest takes the Paten (from *patena*, a plate), on which are the Breads or Hosts (from *hostia*, a Victim, because presently to become the Body of Him Who was offered for us), and raising it with both hands offers it to GOD. Then, taking the Chalice to the Epistle corner, he receives from the Server the Wine, which he pours into the Chalice, with a small quantity of Water, and returning to the midst of the Altar, offers the Chalice likewise, and covers the Paten with a portion of the Corporal and the Chalice with the Pall. He mixes Water with Wine, because our LORD consecrated the Paschal Cup at the Last Supper, which, according to the Jewish Ritual, contained Water as well as Wine. (Le Brun, vol. i. p. 310.) The symbolism of the Mixed Cup is, first, the Blood and Water proceeding from our SAVIOUR'S wounded side, also the union of His people with our LORD, the Wine representing CHRIST (says S. Cyril), and the water, the people. The Pall is replaced upon the Chalice, not for any symbolism, but for precaution, that nothing may fall into it. Having offered the Chalice with prayer, the Priest turns to the people, and with extended hands asks their prayers. He extends, and then again joins, his hands, to engage the faithful by act, as well as by word, to unite with him in prayer. In the English Office, the Prayer for the Church then follows, with the Oblation of the Bread and Wine, and the alms of the people.

The Prayer for the whole state of CHRIST'S Church being finished, the English Rite prescribes a preparation for Communion, in the Exhortation, Confession, and declaratory Absolution, followed by the Comfortable Words, spoken by our LORD, S. Paul, and S. John, in Holy Scripture. The Priest then returns to the action of the Sacrifice. Raising his hands, he turns to the people and says the *Sursum corda*. All the ancient Offices commend this action, as uniting at one time the exhortation to lift up our hearts with the outward and visible sign of that elevation. After the Response, "We lift them up unto the LORD," the Priest says the *Gratias agamus*, joining his hands again, and raising his eyes towards Heaven, to express by that gesture, as far as possible, the desire to render to GOD this act of thanks. After the Response, "It is meet and right so to do," has been given, the Priest, keeping the hands uplifted, and now extended, turns to the Altar, and goes on with the Preface, which he recites in a clear, intelligible voice, for the Preface should be heard of all the faithful, being a mutual exhortation of Priest and people, to give thanks and praise to GOD, in which already they demand the right to join their voice with those of Angels and Archangels, and to exclaim together, "Holy, Holy, Holy."

The Preface is so called because it is the immediate introduction to the Canon, or most holy part of the Celebration, and thus by its use the Church imitates her Head and Founder, who returned thanks to His Eternal FATHER before He recalled Lazarus to life, and when He multiplied the loaves, and changed bread and wine into His own most precious Body and Blood. (*Hierurgia*, Dr. Rock, 87.) In the various Prefaces for the greater Feasts, are mentioned some of the chief characteristics of the especial Mystery, for which thanks are rendered by the Church to GOD at each particular Feast. It is hardly possible that any one can fail to see the propriety of this portion of the Church's Ceremonial, all preparatory, and leading up to, as it were, the Great Act. The Priest, having a little lowered the tone in which he recited the Preface, should nevertheless speak in a plainly intelligible voice, for the people are always invited to join in the Canticle which follows. He joins his hands, and inclines his head, to indicate the deep reverence and awe with which he takes into his lips the words which, S. John says, the Angels sing eternally. The Sanctus is, as it were, the Song of Heaven, and knowing it to be so, we begin to practise here that which we hope will be our employment for all eternity in the Heavenly Courts. This Canticle is sung at all Celebrations, not even on days of penitence or at burials is it excluded, for it were impossible that it

should ever produce weariness in the mind, though one should spend days and nights in reciting it.

Before the Great Act of the Consecration, the English Office prescribes a Prayer of 'Humble Access,' to be said by the Priest, kneeling at the Altar, confessing his own unworthiness and that of the people for so great a nearness to their Divine LORD. It contains a very distinct and unfaltering expression of the Doctrine of the Real Presence of our LORD'S Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, beseeching GOD that "we may so eat the Flesh of His dear SON JESUS CHRIST, and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed by His most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us." Words could not well be plainer, and no 'explaining away' can avail, in the face of such studied precision of terms.

Then follows a short pause, while the Priest is engaged in secret Prayer, standing before the Altar in readiness to 'do' His tremendous office.

But as the Priest stands thus ministering before the Altar, executing his representative Office, he is himself, by the provision of the Church, vested in a symbolical and distinctive garb, proper to the exercise of this one portion only of his Priestly functions. The Eucharistic Vestments, concerning which so much agitation and discussion are at this moment rife, may now conveniently be noticed, before proceeding with the Ritual of the Canon. Over the Cassock, which is the ordinary garment of a Priest, he has to wear, when celebrating the Divine Office, the Amice, Alb and Girdle, Stole, Maniple, and Chasuble. To each of these, some of which originated only in convenience, or the use of common life, a symbolical character has attached ever since their adoption by the Church to be part of the distinctive habit of her Ministering Priests. And this character is for the most part twofold, emblematic of particular virtues and graces, and at the same time having reference,—arbitrarily, it may be (but that is really nothing one way or the other), to something which our Blessed Saviour bore at the time of His Passion, and so, becoming His representative and vicegerent in the exercise of his Office. (T. à Kempis, *Im.* book iv. c. 5.) These symbolical meanings are brought home to the mind of the Priest himself by the prayers which he is directed by the Church to use in vesting, and which may serve as our guide to the significance of each portion of the Vestments.

The Priest first puts on the *Amice*, a piece of white linen, which put first upon, and over, the head, rests on and covers the

shoulders. The name is derived from *amicire;* its use dates from the eighth century. The practice for many centuries was to allow it to rest upon the head until the vesting should be complete, when it was brought down and worn about the neck and throat. It will be found very conspicuous in old portraits of Bishops and Priests, in Ecclesiastical Vestments; *e.g.* of William of Wykeham, Waynflete, and Wolsey. The idea that the Priest should go to the Altar armed against the assaults of evil spirits, and, according to S. Paul, "take the helmet of salvation" (Eph. vi. 17), is expressed in the vesting prayer:—"Place, O Lord, the helmet of salvation upon my head, to repel the assaults of the devil." Pursuing still further the old symbolism, from one supposed object of the Amice,—to cover and protect the neck and throat, and so to preserve the voice,—came a figurative meaning as a restraint upon its use[1]. The old Missals of Cambray bring out this significance in the prayer prescribed at putting on the amice:—"Restrain and chasten my voice, O Lord, that I offend not in my tongue, but may be found worthy to speak those things that are pleasing unto Thee." In regard of the Passion of our Lord, the Amice represents the Veil with which He was blindfolded, or sometimes the Crown of Thorns.

The first Vestment, enveloping the person, is the *Alb,* a robe in use among persons of condition in the Roman empire. The derivation of its name is obvious; its appropriateness to the Service of the Sanctuary is hardly less so. They who serve at the Altar of the Lamb without spot, are fitly robed in white. The prayer at putting on the Alb is, "Cleanse me, O Lord, and purify my heart, that, washed in the Blood of the Lamb, I may attain everlasting joy." The Alb, further represents the white robe in which Herod 'arrayed' our Lord, and sent Him back to Pilate[2]. They who are clothed in garments long and large provide themselves with a girdle, for convenience of walking and engaging in work of any kind. "Gird thyself," said the Angel to S. Peter, when he awoke him, sleeping in the prison. S. Bede and Raban speak of the *Girdle* as necessary, that the Alb do not descend too low and impede the movements of the Priest, but note also its symbolic meaning as a sign of carefulness in preservation of purity, as the Church directs him to pray:—"Gird me, O Lord, with the Girdle of purity, and quench in me the fire of concupiscence, that the grace of temperance and chastity may abide in me." In the Girdle is seen the cord by which our Lord was

[1] Posui ori meo custodiam . . . in isto primo vestimento admonetur castigatio vocis.—*Amalaire,* l. 2. c. 17.

[2] Le Brun, v. i. p. 45.

bound to the pillar of scourging, or that with which He was led from Gethsemane, after they had bound Him. The *Maniple* was originally simply a handkerchief, or *Sudarium*, a sufficiently needful appendage to the Vestment, in tropical climates. It is suggestive of labour and sorrow, and the Priest prays as he takes it up:—"Grant me, O LORD, to bear the life-burden of grief and sorrow, that I may with gladness receive the reward of my labour." Some take the Maniple to represent the chains which bound our LORD when He was scourged; others, to represent by its weight on the arm, the weight of our sins which our SAVIOUR bore. The *Stole*, of old the *Orarium*, and of fine linen, and worn for mere convenience, by public speakers, "pour s'essuier le visage," came to be a distinctive ornament in the Church, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and assumed gradually the present form. Raban Maur identifies the Orarium with the Stole, A.D. 819[1]. The Church regards the Stole as a Vestment of dignity, and would desire the Priest in vesting for the Altar to beseech of GOD, "The robe of immortality, which I lost by the sin of my first parents." The Stole has thus become an emblem of authority, and is worn by a Bishop, hanging straight down in front; by the Priest, under the Vestments, crossed on the breast; and by the Deacon upon one shoulder only; the Sub-Deacon does not wear it at all. The Stole being worn like a yoke on the shoulders, is taken to represent the humility and obedience of our LORD for the expiation of our sins, and by some, to have reference to the bonds with which He was distressed while bearing the Cross along the Way of Sorrows. The *Chasuble*, which is the principal symbolical Eucharistic Vestment (from *casula*, a little house), and originally of very ample size, was a circular Vestment, open only at the top, to pass over the head of the wearer. For seven centuries it was more or less the type of the ordinary long garment in general use. When the World laid it aside the Church retained it, and regarded it as a Vestment fitly representing the yoke and service of CHRIST, including and enveloping the whole body. She imprinted upon it the mark of her Divine LORD, as now borne upon the front of the Chasuble, in Italy, and sometimes in Germany; and in Belgium, France, and England, upon the back. The Chasuble admits of, and receives by the piety of the faithful, almost unlimited ornament. For convenience' sake its dimensions have, in France and Belgium, been greatly retrenched, to the

[1] Quintum est, quod orarium dicitur, licet hoc quidam stolam vocent. Rab. M. l. i. c. 19.

detriment of its beauty and proportion. The Gothic form ornamented with the Y cross is the form generally restored amongst ourselves. The vesting prayer points to the symbolical meaning above noted:—"O LORD, Who hast said, My yoke is easy and My burden is light, grant that I may so bear it as to attain Thy grace." The Chasuble represents the 'purple garment' put on the Person of our LORD by the soldiers of Pilate; or, as some take it, the 'seamless coat,' of which it was said, "Let us not rend it." The Gothic form, with the orphreys covering the seams, seems to favour the latter symbolism. The Priest, thus completely vested, represents the Person of CHRIST, and approaches the Altar, as our Blessed LORD ascended Calvary, and, as He, to offer for the people—He, His full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, with Blood, once offered—His vicegerent and representative, the 'Pure Offering,' 'the Unbloody Sacrifice,' 'the showing forth the LORD's Death,' 'in every place offered' unto GOD's Name until He come.

In examining the works of many authorities who have written upon the origin, history, and significance of the Eucharistic Vestments, we are struck at once by the fact, that that which has been so triumphantly paraded as a fatal argument against their restoration in the Church of England, *viz.* their origin in the ordinary costume, of the time, of the early Christian Church, so far from being evaded or ignored, is invariably brought first into prominent notice, and the 'adoption' and retention of the Vestments, by the Church, traced out. The argument, as against the Vestments, adopted and invested with a distinctive character by Ecclesiastical authority, is, in fact, not only feeble and jejune, but absolutely untenable.

To continue our examination of the Ritual of the Divine Office, which has been traced generally up to the Canon. Hitherto, the character of the Service has been preparatory, increasing in solemnity as the chief Act is approached. The Canon (signifying 'a rule,' because this part of the Office has ever been most particularly fixed, regulated, and determined by rule) is, in fact, the very *Action* of the Sacrifice, and has sometimes been so termed. In the English Office it has three principal divisions: the first, Commemorative of the Passion; the second, the Invocation; the third, the Consecration. In the rest of the Western Church the division is into six portions, the Canon being vastly longer and more full, as in our First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The Priest, on rising from the Prayer of Access, says the *secreta* proper to the moment: his posture is, of course, standing, as offering Sacrifice—the

hands are at first lifted and extended, as signifying the uplifting of the heart at the solemn moment, then joined, and the head bowed, in humble supplication, as the secret prayers are commenced. The Priest makes the sign of the Cross thrice over the Elements, as he beseeches GOD to accept and bless 'these Gifts, these Presents, these unspotted Sacrifices,' to signify that the whole value of this Sacrifice is derived entirely from the efficacy of the One Great Sacrifice upon the Cross of Calvary. He then goes on to pray that the merits of the Great Sacrifice may be applied to the Holy Catholic Church, its rulers, and all its members, to the temporal powers of the world, and to all mankind, but 'especially those of the household of faith.' Special Intercessions for the Living and Remembrance of the Dead follow, the Priest standing with joined hands and eyes raised towards the Cross, his usual posture during 'mental' prayer; but when reading from the Office Book, he extends his hands. He then commemorates the Saints departed, according to the use of the most ancient Liturgies, to realize the 'Communion of Saints,' at this most solemn moment, and proceeds to the Consecration according to the prescribed form of the Divine Office. At the Invocation, beginning, in the English Office, "Hear us, O Merciful FATHER," he spreads his hands[1] over the Bread and Wine, in token of benediction and of devotion to the purpose of Sacrifice, as the Priest in the Jewish rite was commanded to lay his hands on the head of the victim to be offered, and it should be acceptable. When he mentions the Bread and Wine, he signs each Kind with the Cross, to bring again to mind the Passion of our LORD, as the great subject represented by the Act in which he is engaged, and repeats the sign at the words, 'Body and Blood" in the succeeding sentence. He then uncovers the Elements, preparatory to Consecration, and to symbolize the stripping off of our LORD'S raiment, and proceeds to the Act of Consecration. In this, the most solemn Act of his sacred Office, the Priest follows the gestures of the Great HIGH PRIEST Himself, as He instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice, taking the Paten into his hand, raising his eyes towards the Cross, breaking the Bread, and laying his hand upon either Element, as he pronounces the Words of Consecration.

Immediately on the Consecration of the Sacrament, in either Kind, the Priest kneels in acknowledgment and adoration of the Divine Presence, then, rising, "takes into his hand" the Paten,

[1] This gesture dates from about 1500; the earlier Ritual directed merely the lifting up the hands, as in the other prayers. Le Brun.

or Chalice, and lifting it, fulfils the great object of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and 'shows forth the LORD's Death,' before GOD, and before the world, as the "One full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." The Elevation is simply the suitable Action accompanying the significant, and sacrificial Word, "*Do* this in remembrance of Me." The most ancient Liturgies express the belief of the Early Church that the act of Elevation was observed by our Blessed LORD Himself at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist. "It symbolizes exactly the lifting up of CHRIST on the Cross, and thus most fitly enters into the Liturgy, which is, among other things, a typical drama of the Passion, and not merely a rite of Communion." "It marks also, clearly for the people, especially for such as cannot read, or may be too far in church to follow the service accurately, the most solemn point in the Liturgy. The Eastern Church provides for this intimation by the gestures and words of the Deacon; the Roman Church warns the faithful by the sound of a bell. But in the English Church, failing Elevation, they have no guidance, and are placed at a positive disadvantage." Dr. Littledale's exhaustive Essay on 'The Elevation of the Host,' from which the above extracts are made, will prove most valuable to any who are not well acquainted with its significance and unquestionable authority, in the Church of England.

At the conclusion of the Consecration, after covering up again the Body and Blood of our LORD with the corner of the Corporal and the Pall, the Priest kneels again, then rising, prays in silence, before his own reception. This silence is taken to fulfil the words of the Psalmist, "the LORD is in His holy Temple, let all the earth keep silence before Him," and to represent the stillness of the Sepulchre wherein our LORD was laid. The Communion of the Priest is an essential part of the Sacrifice. He therefore receives It standing, kneeling down for a moment's adoration, before, and after, receiving either Kind. In communicating the people, the Priest begins on the left, and South side, and continues administering from left to right, it is said, in token of the progress in holiness which the receiving these holy mysteries ought to produce:—"They will go from strength to strength." At the conclusion of the Communion of the people, the Priest again covers the Blessed Sacrament, representing the veiling our LORD's Divinity in the Incarnation, and kneels once more; then rising, he begins the LORD's Prayer. All the oldest Liturgies contain this Prayer, which indeed is generally thought to have been introduced into the Divine Liturgy by the Apostles

themselves. The LORD'S Prayer is said here with a special reference to the lovingkindness and beneficence of GOD in bestowing upon us this Gift of all gifts. To the LORD'S Prayer succeeds that well known in all Liturgies, but said at different times; in the English Rite, it is used as a Post Communion Prayer, when the completed, acted Sacrifice is formally offered once more to our Heavenly FATHER, and that for 'all the whole Church,' as all have need, and wheresoever on the face of the earth they may be scattered abroad. According to the English Office, too, the *Gloria in Excelsis* occurs after the Communion of the faithful, the LORD'S Prayer, and the Post Communion. The position of this Hymn of Praise is peculiar; the symbolism is probably the representation of the Hymn sung by our Blessed LORD and His disciples before they went out to the Garden of Gethsemane. The *Gloria in Excelsis* was sometimes omitted, by ancient custom, as, *e. g.*, on certain penitential days, or sometimes was said plainly, although its singing is a feature of the High Celebration.

The Gloria is commenced by the Priest, with extended hands, as at the Creed. At the word 'GOD,' he joins his hands, and makes an inclination of the head; he continues to 'keep his hands together,' and at the conclusion of the whole hymn signs himself with the Cross, thus signifying the custom of the Ancient Church to begin and end all important actions with the Cross of CHRIST. The Person of the Blessed SON it is which is represented at the Altar, not that of the FATHER, nor of the SPIRIT, and so the Priest inclines not at the Name of FATHER, nor of the HOLY SPIRIT, but when that of the SON is mentioned. From the Gloria, the English Rite passes at once to the final Benediction and dismissal. The faithful should always remain until the Priest has departed from the Sanctuary. In the final benediction, 'the Peace,' and 'the Blessing,' are taken to represent the appearances of our LORD to His disciples after His Resurrection; 'Peace be unto you' was His salutation on Easter Day, and at His last manifestation He lifted His hands and blessed them, and so was parted from their sight. (Durandus, *Rationale*, l. v. c. 15.)

'Immediately after the Blessing,' the Priest is directed, in the English Office, to consume all That remains of the Holy Sacrament; this done, standing at the Altar, after having knelt in adoration, the Ablutions are administered by the Server. The Priest having consumed the Ablutions also, with prayer, then dries and covers the Chalice and Paten, folds up the Corporal and Veil, and arranges the Burse and silk outer Veil; then, after a few moments' private prayer, and the sign of the Cross, he

takes the sacred vessels from the Altar, descends the steps, and with a reverence towards the centre of the Altar, leaves the Sanctuary, preceded by the Server, and returns to the Sacristy.

A High or Solemn Celebration is merely the addition, to the ordinary Celebration, of the accessories of attendant Ministers, Deacon, Subdeacon, and Acolytes, of Music throughout the Office, of Incense, and other symbolical Usages. The Ritual of the Celebration proper, only so far varies from that of the Low Celebration, that several of the lesser acts performed by the Celebrating Priest are, in the High Celebration, given into the hands of the Assistants. The Office is rich in symbolism, and capable of being celebrated with almost any degree of grandeur and beauty. The necessary limits of the present paper, and the length to which it has already been extended, preclude the possibility of tracing the exhibition of the symbolical principle through the details of the solemn Celebration. Enough, it is hoped, has been adduced, by way of illustration, to support the proposition advanced in the earlier pages of the Essay, that the complete and elaborate Ritual System of the Church Catholic, is not fairly open to the charge of formalism and unmeaning ceremonialism, frivolity, or 'pernicious nonsense;' but is, on the contrary, a most carefully constructed system of intelligent Symbolism. A satisfactory reason can be given for almost every Ceremony made use of in the Divine Office, which is the chief Act of Worship of the Church. They are outward signs of the inward dispositions with which we ought to be animated, and means of exciting them within us. They are Divinely-appointed aids to faith, scaffold-poles to the spiritual building, which we can by no means afford to despise, or cast aside during its daily growth and progress.

But all attempts to defend the outward system of the Church, and to vindicate her symbolical teaching, will in these days be met by the self-flattering, popular, and apparently all-convincing argument, that the necessity for such a system is superseded by the enlightenment of modern times; that the human race is so advanced in intelligence as to have outgrown such modes of teaching. The following plain words from the Sermon on Symbolism, by Mr. Molyneux, from which we have already quoted, seem not inaptly to furnish, in conclusion, a plea for, at least, some consideration before these pages are thrown aside, and the subject dismissed, upon so hasty and ill-founded an hypothesis:—

"Without now discussing the question, how far such extraordi-

nary enlightenment is justly claimed for the nineteenth century, I would observe that persons whose minds are really of the highest order, and whose imaginations are most cultivated, especially prize and delight in Symbolism. In proof of this, I appeal to all the noblest works of genius, in literature and art, throughout all ages. And further, to say we have outgrown teaching by Symbolism, is to say we have outgrown the teaching of the Bible. With persons who will say this, we are not now concerned; but with those who believe that the Bible supplies us, in fulness and perfection, with both matter and manner of teaching, which is of perpetual truth and excellence."

CHARLES JAMES LE GEYT.

THE END.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

Now publishing, uniform in 8vo.

Tracts for the Day:

ESSAYS ON THEOLOGICAL SUBJECTS;

EDITED BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

THE interest excited by the publication of *The Church and the World* has been proved, not only by the many reviews and critical notices of the book which have appeared, and its wide and rapid circulation, but also by numerous applications for the separate re-issue of the various Essays it contains, at a low price and in a pamphlet form.

Practical objections to this scheme interfere with its adoption. But in fulfilment of a similar design, which was abandoned in favour of the publication of a volume of combined Essays, and in order to meet the wishes of those who desire the issue of a series of separate treatises, the following plan has been undertaken.

A Series of Essays will be published, dealing with theological subjects similar to those discussed in *The Church and the World*, treated from the same point of view, and serving, in some degree, as a supplement to those which have already appeared, and to those which are preparing for publication in the SECOND SERIES of the same work.

These Essays will be addressed to educated and intelligent Catholics, who, as loyal members of the Church of England, are unable to accept the popular explanation of her Doctrines, and decline to be bound to the popular misrepresentations of her Discipline. They will aim at stating in plain language the reasons which make the Religionism of the day untenable; and will illustrate and defend the historical Belief and traditional Practice of Christendom. They will thus be at once aggressive and constructive; and, whilst seeking to avoid that timid indecision which calls itself 'moderation,' they will carefully eschew polemical bitterness.

It is proposed to publish these Essays in a consecutive Series bearing the title of *Tracts for the Day;* and the first issue contemplated will consist of about twelve treatises.

The following have already been published, or are in course of publication:—

No. 1. PRIESTLY ABSOLUTION; SCRIPTURAL, 48 pp., price 9*d.* *2nd Thousand.*
No. 2. PURGATORY, 48 pp., price 9*d.* *2nd Thousand.*
No. 3. THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS, 88 pp., price 1*s.* 6*d.*
No. 4. MIRACLES AND PRAYER, 32 pp., price 6*d.*
No. 5. THE REAL PRESENCE. In the press.

To be followed by—

CASUISTRY.
VESTMENTS.
SACRAMENT OF UNCTION.
EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP.
A HIGH CELEBRATION.
SACRAMENTALISM.

LONDON: LONGMANS & CO.

In the Press, in one Vol. 8vo, Price 15s., the Third Edition of

The Church and the World:

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY IN 1866.

EDITED BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

CONTENTS.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION. By Professor Rogers.
THE MISSIONARY ASPECT OF RITUALISM. By Dr. Littledale.
INFANTICIDE. By Canon Humble.
CATHEDRAL REFORM. By M. E. C. Walcott, B.D.
REVIVAL OF CONFRATERNITIES. By S. Baring-Gould, M.A.
HOSPITAL AND WORKHOUSE NURSING. By Dr. Meadows.
CLERICAL CELIBACY. By J. E. Vaux, M.A.
RE-UNION OF THE CHURCH. By E. L. Blenkinsopp, M.A.
THIRTY YEARS IN THE CHURCH: an Autobiography.
POSITIVISM. By I. Gregory Smith, M.A.
REVELATION AND SCIENCE.
THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By P. G. Medd, M.A.
VOWS. By T. T. Carter, M.A.
FOREIGN GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. By G. E. Street, A.R.A.
SCIENCE AND PRAYER. By M. Mac Coll, M.A.
LIMITS OF LAWFUL RITUALISM. By T. W. Perry.
THE LITURGIES OF 1549 AND 1662. By the Editor.

Extracts from Reviews.

This Volume may be considered as a sort of manifesto by the Ritualist party. If any one wishes to understand the meaning and objects of Ritualism, and to learn what is the defence which the Ritualists have to offer, he must be referred to this Book.—The Times.

[One Essay] is remarkable as an illustration of the true character and pernicious effects of the superstition which is spreading widely and silently among some parts of the population, and especially among ladies.—Pall Mall Gazette.

Without any claim to authority, [these Essays] may be said fairly to represent contemporary opinion, as it exists among advanced Churchmen, on many interesting Questions of the day.—Guardian.

This Volume—a wretched compound of Sacerdotalism, Ritualism, and Jesuitry—proceeds from the most advanced of the extreme Ritualists, [and] is replete with insolence and presumption, and bears a thoroughly Roman face.—Record.

Some of the eighteen papers show a great deal of research ; and all of them, with scarcely an exception, show a generous and gentleman-like spirit, which is refreshing in theological Essays.—SATURDAY REVIEW.

The intelligence of the nineteenth century is not about to give way before a handful of effeminate fanatics, whether the Bishops approve of them or not. . . The so-called Catholic revival means merely that intelligent men have withdrawn from participation in the whole matter, and enthusiasts, dreamers, knaves, and fools have now the field to themselves.—FRASER'S MAGAZINE.

The homœopathic principle that 'like cures like,' if a heresy in medicine, has always been regarded as sound doctrine in the economy of grace. It is, therefore, the most natural and proper thing in the world that we should have a volume of Catholic *Essays and Reviews*.—CHURCH TIMES.

Although Rubric and Ritual are watchwords of the sect, their real design is far from being merely the gratuitous and futile restoration of trifling ceremonies and elaborate ecclesiastical finery. Their ultimate aim is no less than the utter subjugation of Protestant principles.—MORNING POST.

For all practical purposes this Book is the 'platform' of the Neo-tractarian or (so called) Ritualist party ; and it discloses in bold, clear language, and with almost fatuous candour, a programme which leaves the dreams, much more the plans, of all previous reactionists in our Church many miles behind. —DAILY NEWS.

The Ritual movement, which began in the English Church soon after the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*, has lately entered on a new phase which, at [an earlier] date, could hardly have been imagined as possible. . . . . The latest work of considerable size which the Ritualists have put forth is the Volume of Essays . . . . [in which] we have the principles of the party enunciated more clearly than elsewhere.—QUARTERLY REVIEW.

We have seen that the Ritualists as a body are what they have been truly called, Nonconformists within the Church. . . . We cannot burn them, as in the days of Mary ; we cannot hang them, as in the days of Elizabeth ; we cannot banish them as in the days of Charles I. or Cromwell. By driving them to extremities we might perpetuate the evil for generations.— EDINBURGH REVIEW.

The gentlemen who were bound up in that fagot of Neologian sticks called *Essays and Reviews* did the rough work of pioneers in a novel style of associated literary partnership. . . . . But all these efforts [on behalf of a 'movement,'] must give place to the present magnificent enterprise, for the bulk of matter, variety of subject, and number of contributors.—CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

This Volume does infinite credit to the rising Catholic or Ritualistic School —to its liberality, activity of mind, and research. The writers are no crabbed formalists, but take wide views. . . . They only require a fair field and no favour ; for not only in active labours, but in the world of thought and literature, they are well able to hold their own.—FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

The book is made upon the sandwich principle. [The Editor] is aware that as thick slices of ham, alone, would turn men's stomachs ; so mere naked Popery would only disgust and repel. He has therefore enclosed his unclean flesh between slices of bread, in the hope of thus getting the whole swallowed without nausea or complaint.—CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

In the present goodly Volume there is a well conceived and very successful attempt to bring together into an almost encyclopædiac form all that the acknowledged experts on imminent Church subjects have to say in their several departments.—JOHN BULL.

As we predicted, the Essays are exciting notice, partly by their avowed repugnance to the teaching of the Church unless supplemented by Roman

doctrine, but chiefly on account of the Volume having been unhappily patronized by the Bishops in Convocation.—Clerical Journal.

The Key-note which runs through the whole of these compositions is, that the Church is not only supernatural in its origin, but supernatural in its working and constitution, and especially in its Ministry and Sacraments. The World, on the other hand, is natural.—Westminster Review.

Heaven forbid we should suggest that the squadron before us consists of holy pokers; but we can imagine them saying among themselves—If Puseyite nudge Puseyite, what is that to a literary journal? The whole is a quiet dose of Semi-Romanism; a pot of mild 'half-and-half.'—Athenæum.

Such a volume as this, treating of such and so many subjects, at such considerable length, and with so conspicuous an amount of knowledge and ability, must certainly be set down among the 'Signs of the Times.'—Literary Churchman.

Judged from a literary point of view, these Essays certainly attain a high standard of merit; they bear upon them the stamp of intellect, and are the offspring of thoughtful and inquiring minds.—London Review.

We are bound to testify not only to a large amount of interesting matter in the Essays, but also to the generally fair and courteous spirit which pervades them, and to the absence of studied misrepresentation and of personal attack.—Month.

As a whole, the spirit of the Volume is unexceptionable; conceding the stand-point of the writers, there is but little intolerance, and no abuse. Some of the papers are very beautiful in style, very admirable in feeling, and very able in execution; there is, however, a great deal of bad argument, and untenable assumption.—British Quarterly Review.

[This Book] is a very important and valuable contribution to a class of literature which needs, and is daily receiving, greater enlargement. . . . . Treating as it does of questions which concern the inner life of the Church and her work in the World, and handling those Questions with unusual ability, earnestness, and thoughtfulness, it deserves to be carefully read and pondered.—Church and State Review.

The whole thing is only a natural production of the *Tracts for the Times*. . . . . Indeed when we return from Ultra-Ritualism to the religion of the Bible, we seem to enter an utterly different atmosphere . . . . and the only wonder is, how any Ultra-Ritualist can bear to read the Bible at all.—Christian Advocate.

Two of the Essays are anonymous . . . all the other sixteen, with two exceptions, are by Clergymen and High Churchmen, and are all written with great fairness, care, and good sense, here and there rising into brilliancy and logical power.—Standard.

We have here the cream of ever so many Quarterlies blended into one Volume, with a systematic and avowed purpose. . . . . The Essays differ from one another more as to the subject and manner of handling, than in the ability brought to bear on them. [They] have all the appearance of being picked, and of being, for the most part, carefully written throughout.—Church Review.

We see plainly that there are many extreme Anglicans who are deluded indeed by the dream of Corporate Union, but who write, and, no doubt, think in a truly Christian and temperate spirit. As to the Volume before us, we do not profess to have looked at it very carefully.—Dublin Review.

Our acknowledgments are due to the Editor, [who] has made an excellent selection both of subjects and writers. Of all, we can say that they are real 'Questions of the Day,' so that no one can take up the Volume without finding something to interest him in it; and there is not one subject that is not well treated.—Ecclesiastic.

These Clergy who adopt and publish the rank superstitions of Papal Rome are ministers of the State Church, accredited teachers of the State Religion, whose influence is magnified by their national *status*. . . . A Catholic Revival means an advent of ceremonial and priestly superstition, which kills the morality, intelligence, and independence of true Religion, and breeds instead mawkish sentiment and servile credulity.—PATRIOT.

These Essayists are not writing for a literary exercise, or an oratorical display, but with a serious purpose and under the pressure of strong convictions. . . . There is nothing [in the Book] of the 'reserve' some excellent men carried to such extravagant length in the earlier Tractarian movement, no blinking ugly facts, nor slurring over unpopular doctrines.—UNION REVIEW.

We have said that there is no definite connexion between the papers; but there is one good and solid, if indefinite link—a devout and reverent spirit, which shows itself in hearty love for the Church, a fearless exposure of error, a zeal for reform, an assertion of great principles.—CHURCHMAN.

There is in every one of the Essays a good deal of interesting, if no of very novel reflection. Much that has been reduced to writing has been on 'discussion's lip' for years. The Book is one sure to attract notice.—READER.

These Essays, published under the above title, are, without doubt, more remarkable and outspoken than any previous productions of the Tractarian party. . . . Opinions [formerly] guardedly expressed aroused fierce indignation; whereas Tractarian writers of the present day, who use bolder language, are more readily listened to, and meet with more impartial criticism.—TABLET.

Of the Book in general, we may say that it is very creditable to the learning and talent, the piety and energy of the section of the Church which it represents.—JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE.

To *The Church and the World* the advocates of antique millinery point as containing uncontrovertible authority for its use; and from the same collection of Essays the denouncer of the Ritualistic tendencies of the age learns of the enormities which he loves to condemn.—SUNDAY GAZETTE.

The Ritualist party in England have put forth their literary power; and the leading peculiarities of the Romish system are boldly advocated, and with some considerable measure of ability and even of unction.—BULWARK.

It is a 'Sign of the Times' that such a volume should have made its appearance. . . . It is evident that the writers consider the star of their party to be in the ascendant, and the cause of extreme and Romanizing Sacerdotalism is one which no longer requires apology for its claims, or disguise as to its principles or plans.—METHODIST MAGAZINE.

The plot for Romanizing the Church of England, which was laid at Oxford thirty years ago, has brought forth abundant fruit, and has indeed been successful far beyond what could have been thought possible . . . [and] a supplementary volume, in which the views of Anglican Romanism are to be still more fully developed is announced by the publishers of this ill-omened combination for Romanizing this once Protestant realm.—LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The appearance of this Book is a portent not to be neglected by those who feel an interest in the Anglican Church. It is the confession of earnest-minded men that the Establishment has been weighed and found wanting, and it records their gropings for a remedy that shall enable their Ecclesiastical system to do some reasonable share of the duty allotted to it, and to give some not totally inadequate return for the vast power and wealth with which it has been entrusted.—NATION (New York).

BINDING SECT. NOV 21 1978

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

HEccIE
S

Shipley, Orby (ed.)
The Church and the world, essays on the questions of the day in 1867.

90

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 13 14 22 08 009 1